

# THE REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

---

Vol. X.

October, 1913

No. 4.

---

## THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ADONIRAM JUDSON.

By W. O. CARVER, TH.D., D.D., LOUISVILLE, KY.

In this centennial year and almost on the anniversary of his baptism in India (September 6, 1812), it is fitting that some effort be made to give a definite statement of the influence he has exerted in the world by reason of his service as a Christian missionary. In this paper no effort at all is made to recount Judson's history. That is taken for granted here. Of the names of the first generation of modern missionaries that stand for heroism in the minds of Christians generally those of Carey and Judson would, no doubt, on all hands be placed in a class by themselves. This is partly due to the circumstances of their service and partly to the heroic mould of the personality of the men. Neither of them stands alone in service. Neither could have become a missionary at all, or could have achieved such greatness as is accorded him, except by the help of others. Both were ready always to acknowledge this. Indeed, one of the great lessons taught by both these men is the true greatness of humility and the power of a devotion to a great cause wholly free from self-seeking. With Carey this humble self-effacement is largely an original grace and one of the easiest of all his achievements in character.

Judson was ambitious, eager for reputation, determined to lead and to shine. He was consciously brilliant, capable and cultured and eager to be known as a factor in the world's life. This ideal in his young manhood held him aloof from the ministry and from personal acceptance of Christ. Yet his insight was clear. He knew what it meant to be a follower of the Man of Nazareth. In a great crisis he definitely denied self, took up his cross and became in remarkable degree a follower of Jesus. This surrender was once and for all. It was never difficult to labor with him, for his purpose was single, his motive pure, his docility obvious, his mastery desired. The grace of God has done no finer work in leading captive a strong and ambitious will.

The pioneer character of his work, the obstacles in his way, the dangers incurred and the extreme sufferings and privations he bore and the splendid spirit in which he endured them all have combined with other features to make Judson one of the most popular of all the heroes of the Church. Almost every group biography of heroic missionaries includes an account of him. He is universally admired and his example cited by men of all communions. Some heroic missionaries have the histrionic temperament and a gift for getting into dramatic situations. They see the dramatic and heroic in incidents that would be commonplace to other men. They keep diaries from which it is easy to make up a great story. Judson was as far as possible removed from all this. Without condemning this type one may still accord the larger praise to one who endures hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ without the too obvious consciousness of his heroism. Judson was such a soldier. He even made too little of his experiences. When he found out the tendency to make him out a great hero he sought to destroy all the correspondence and records that could be used to lionize him. In this one way perhaps he gave evidence of a lingering consciousness of his once great ambition for the glory of men. As a rule

he behaved as if he had never been self-conscious nor had a struggle to be humble.

He suffered bravely and uncomplainingly the wrongs and oppressions inflicted directly or indirectly by the British and Burmese governments, he took without reviling the spoiling of his goods and the indignities and cruelties imposed upon his person in the repeated and extended imprisonments under conditions of shame and suffering no longer to be met with in any part of the world. This is the more noteworthy that he was a man of delicate and refined sensibilities, always careful of his body, and peculiarly sensitive to uncleanness, immodesty and coarseness. To know that about him and then to read of the foul prisons, the excruciating tortures and the unspeakable surroundings of his prison experiences makes one marvel at the possibilities of endurance for the faith of the Gospel, and for the redemption of lost men.

Worst of all were the bereavements by the death of his two wives and his children and the witnessing of the hardship and destruction wrought on them by reason of association with him in the most of his missions. One can endure all things that fall upon him personally for the sake of Christ, but to see his most dearly loved ones suffer because they are his, under the conditions of his duty, this most of all tries faith and breaks the spirit. This, too, Judson bore and his faith failed not.

The courage and faithfulness of this man have been the means of calling many another young man into the service of the Master and into the work of foreign missions. One of the Haystack Seven, he became the most famous of that band. His career more than that of any of the others justified the optimistic vision and the valiant devotion of these young students. Every one of them deserves the reverent recognition of the Church of our Lord. Luther Rice is brought before our readers in the splendid article of last number and this, and along with him all the others are named. This band of young

men is one of the most significant groups of disciples of Jesus ever united in prayer and consecration since the first Apostles who waited on the Master and took up His mission. Samuel John Mills, Jr., was no doubt the master of the group and, so, "the father of foreign missions in America." But Judson is the best known of the group and it was his name more than any other that was on the lips of the centennial celebrants at the dedication of the Haystack monument in 1909.

In the larger knowledge of the conditions of tropical countries, the better understanding of hygienic precautions, the improved facilities for living and travelling, the better relations between governments and missionaries we can see how Judson might have been saved much of his suffering and how the lives of his loved ones might have been spared to him. But in the light he had he did his best and never recklessly dared danger or disease, and his concern for his loved ones was tender and true.

Not only in drawing men into service, but rather more, perhaps, in sustaining men in service has the life of Judson been of worth. Missionaries in India particularly, and elsewhere as well, have been familiar with his career. If they have sometimes learned by his needless sufferings how to save themselves for service, vastly more by his heroic persistence in well-doing under almost insuperable difficulties and unbearable hardships have they learned to endure and persevere. Judson's experience, among others, is the classic one of the seven years' toilsome working before the first fruit of his toil came, the first convert. And this is because of his laconic word of faith when his home board inquired of prospects for success: "As bright as the promises of God." That word has been of untold benefit to the cause of missions in its influence on missionaries, in its weight with home directors when too eager for "results" that could find place in the annual reports, and to the supporters when they have wanted to see returns for their money. Carey

had had a similar experience just a few years before this. Robert Morrison was baptizing his first convert about the time Judson was finding his place in Burma. Carey's experience he knew, Morrison's he possibly learned also, his own is known now of all the interested saints of God.

The outcome in the work Judson began has contributed also to his fame and influence. He went to Burma largely of necessity. He was shut up to this by being shut out of India by the envy of the English in general and the opposition of the East India Company in particular. But he chose a country with people and possibilities, and not some non-strategic island with a handful of people. He was left almost, if not quite wholly, to his own wisdom and initiative in both the location of his work and its methods. On the field before the denomination with which he was to work and from which his support would come had as yet organized for the work or had any experience or even definite study of it, he was necessarily without direction from home. If this left him without interference it also deprived him of sympathetic counsel. If he made mistakes there have been none to see how he could have done better at any time. His success shows the wisdom of appointing missionaries of the largest fitness in character and preparation.

It was Judson's influence first of all that led Baptists of America to undertake foreign missions. Almost from the beginning some in America had given money to the support of the work of the English Baptist Society. Judson made necessary definite and separate American organization. It was he first who became a Baptist in India and, as Dr. Pollard shows in the current article already referred to, a sermon of Judson influenced Luther Rice in his own study of the questions that led him two months after Judson to accept baptism. Rice became the organizing leader and with the help of such men as Staughton, Fuller and others, determined the fact and form of missionary organization for Ameri-

can Baptists. The attitude of opposition in England served also to force independent organizations upon America when otherwise they would have become auxiliary supporters of the English society. Without going at all into these matters, we must here note that Judson's acceptance of Baptist views and church membership was the hinge on which turned the missionary history of American Baptists. His suggestion to a Baptist friend before leaving America planted one seed of organization and his correspondence later greatly promoted the work under the lead of Rice and others at home.

Judson was thus the fountain source from which sprang, first of all, the marvelous mission in Burma, and then the long line of missions of American Baptists in Siam, China, Japan, India, Africa and in Catholic lands. And of course, we must include the missions of Southern Baptists. That Baptists would, before many years, have been led in some other way to organize for this work is practically certain. But we are concerned with Judson as the personal originator in a work that has yielded more communicant members of churches in heathen lands than have resulted from the missions of any other denomination for up to this time this is true of American Baptist missions. This great addition to the Church of Christ and its inspiration stand in the front place as marking Judson's significance.

The remarkable growth of Baptists in America, already begun when Judson came to them, was greatly accelerated and guided by the missionary organization and the encouragement it gave. It has been the missions of Baptists that have made of them a denomination with any sense of unity, and community. Prior to this, and largely still so far as they remain apart from the common missionary tasks, Baptists are segregated and individualistic. Judson's coming, along with Rice, was the dramatic summons that aroused that enthusiasm with which the separate groups of Baptists were drawn to a

common interest and task. And progressively this common interest and task have advanced unity and co-operation among them. No one would claim that this growth is yet complete.

Judson's own culture and education have had no little influence on the use of educational agencies, in the work of American Baptists. Until recently Southern Baptists have employed these means in very limited measure. Even the Baptists of the North have been hesitant and slow in employing them, as compared with some other denominations. But the leadership of Judson and Rice determined that matter favorably to such agencies. When Baptists from America, in December of this year, assemble in large numbers to celebrate the Judson centennial with their brethren in Burma, next to the joy of seeing more than a hundred thousand in full fellowship with them, will be the grateful pride in the great educational plants and system by means of which the religion of Christ has become a fixed and powerful factor in the present life and future hope of the Burmese people.

Judson was fundamentally evangelistic in temper and longing. Every missionary ought to be. Every true missionary is. Like so many missionaries to-day, Judson used to express his own eager desire to be winning converts what time he must spend in planting the institutions and training the natives for evangelism and for intelligent Christian living. But he knew how Jesus chose to indoctrinate the dozen rather than superficially to convert the thousands. No man is fit to work in an educational mission, or for that matter in a Christian school in America, whose heart does not long to be giving personal testimony of his experience in Jesus Christ and winning other men to His following. And the proof of such longing is that some such work the teaching servant is finding time to do in the midst of, and as part of, his pressing duties. Judson was too soon and too much a pioneer to have any such educational work as we know

in missions to-day, but all that has grown up in Burma is in full accord with his own method and is only the carrying out of his plans and the fulfilling of his hopes.

We have already thought of how William Carey and Adoniram Judson are the two most prominent missionaries in the beginning of the modern period. Both were Baptists. Both were men of very definite convictions and of very generous sympathies. Their influence has counted greatly in giving to Baptists a place in the common brotherhood of faith. All Protestant Christian bodies are ready to acknowledge their debt to these great saints. To be sure the manner of Judson's change of church affiliation aroused some bitterness and brought on him at the moment some measure of contempt. But his character was too noble, his motive too pure, his conviction too obvious, his sincerity too transparent for any but small minds persistently to look down upon him or accuse him of "the sin of lying" as was done by one indignant Congregationalist. One wonders whether this irate editor meant to designate a small number when he said: "Our respectable Baptist friends will not boast in the conversion of Mr. Judson, etc.," and to leave the implication that by no means all Baptists were respectable. At all events, we know that it was unfortunately true in those days that by no means were Baptists universally respected by Christians of other communions, however deserving of respect they may have been. Irritating as Judson's "conversion" inevitably was to all whose views of the matter and the subjects of baptism his conduct repudiated and condemned, still his change was in the end one of the most influential means of getting the Baptists' position understood and their insistent conviction respected.

Judson's ability, religion and honor were too well known, and his earlier associates in ecclesiastical faith had taken too much pride in him for them to resist the simple facts of his character and conduct. Once he had cleared his own conscience in the matter and settled his

own church relations, he went on about his business in his chosen work of missionary to the heathen. He bore himself as a noble Christian man. He gained nothing of material or temporal advantage by his change. That was clear to all. He sought in no way to exploit his change or to gain glory from it. He assumed no airs of superiority or excessive holiness. He did not nag or seek to irritate his former associates in ecclesiastical faith. In the matter of money expended on him by the American Board, in the matter of their feelings toward him, in his subsequent behavior, in all things in all respects in making this momentous change he bore himself as a true Christian gentleman and soon none remained who did not honor him and claim their share in him as a Christian leader.

That Baptists have often over-emphasized the conversion of Judson to our views and neglected to rejoice in his great work as a missionary of the cross has to be confessed. Many of us have boasted more in his change of faith than we have been urged by his example of devoted work. There are not a few of us who know of him only that he was led by the Greek Testament to adopt Baptist views of the ordinance of baptism and who, as Dr. Pollard has shown, do not accurately know this fact. But on the whole Judson's influence on Baptists has contributed to a more general and generous consciousness of oneness with the whole body of Christ.

Carey and Judson alike stand for fidelity to conviction as to the claims of Christ on the loyal soul. Carey had come from the Church of England as Judson came now from the Congregationalists, only Carey had come at the time of his personal trust in Jesus as Savior and had had several years in the Baptist ministry before he became a missionary. Both were identified with distinctively Baptist missions and saw in this course the way of wisdom for that time.

It does not follow that either of them would have opposed co-operation if there had been occasion and call for it in their day. It is evident that both would to-day, as always, stand for loyalty to conviction of personal duty. It ought to be said, too, that both stand strongly for openness of mind and heart to new views, to new leading of the Spirit of God. Without this neither of them would ever have been a Baptist. It is this same openness of mind and heart that is supremely needed in Christian souls to-day. It was this, more than anything else, that Jesus longed for in the men of His day and found in little children who became for Him the type of the children of His Kingdom.

Judson was in marked degree a man of childlike graces of openness, faith, frankness, simplicity and loyalty. He is a splendid type for the missionary, a fine lesson for all mission agents and agencies to study, and a great example for all the saints of God.

## THE ATONEMENT THROUGH SYMPATHY.

BY GALUSHA ANDERSON, S.T.D., NEWTON CENTRE, MASS.

Walter Henry Pater, in his *Marius the Epicurean*,\* says, "The constituent practical difference between men" is "their capacity for sympathy." He who is able to apprehend most clearly the wretchedness of those in distress, to feel their sorrows most keenly, to go down to the lowest depths of their misery and suffer with them is rightly esteemed the greatest. Whenever such a man appears, the multitude hails him as a hero.

Now, it is a matter of common observation that those who are purest and best most deeply sympathize with those in misery. To be sure some who have gone to great lengths in sin and crime are at times touched with pity, when they see their friends or neighbors suddenly overwhelmed in some dire calamity. But such cases are exceptional. One of the most awful effects of sin is to harden the heart, to blunt the moral sensibilities. It dries up the fountain of sympathy and tends to make men dead to the woes of others, while the spiritual renewal of men and their consequent fellowship with God in Christ gives them an ever enlarging capacity for sympathy. And the more Christlike they become the more broad and profound is their capacity to suffer with others.

But Christ Himself is absolutely perfect both in knowledge and in compassion. He not only apprehends all the miseries of our race, but through His sympathy and incarnation is identified with all who suffer. Not a sigh bursts from the lips of any one however obscure that He does not hear; not a tear stains any human cheek that He does not see; there is not a quivering nerve, nor a throbbing brain, nor an aching heart that does not

---

\* Vol. 2, p. 203.

stir the depths of His divine compassion. Since He is the God-man He bears on His infinite yet human heart the infirmities, the distresses, the manifold woes of the whole sinful human race.

Let us now note briefly some references in the Gospels to His wonderful sympathy. Again and again we are told that He was moved with compassion, or that He had compassion on those in distress. His miracles of healing were but the outflow of His sympathy. Seeing misery and being conscious that He had the power to alleviate it, His pity spontaneously expressed itself in healing disease, cleansing lepers, casting out demons, and at times in raising the dead, that He might thereby wipe away the tears of the bereaved. In the Gospels, we have specific accounts of scarcely a hundredth part of these miracles of mercy. The great mass of them are barely indicated by general statements, as in Mark 1:32-34.

Later in His ministry, when in controversy with the Pharisees, Christ appealed to the signs wrought by Him as a conclusive proof of His divine mission, but He did not work them just to show that He was sent by God. They were but the natural expression of His tender sympathy with those in sharp distress. Being so understood, they become all the stronger evidence that Jesus was sent by His and our Father to be the Saviour of lost men.

But the religious condition of the multitudes, blighted by sin, and crushed under the burdens laid upon them by their professed teachers, specially broke up the fountain of His compassion, "because they were distressed and scattered, as sheep not having a shepherd."

At times His sympathy with those in trouble vented itself in tears. But Jesus was no weakling; He was the most manly of men. No one ever exceeded Him in down-right courage. In the teeth of adverse public opinion, He always calmly and resolutely said and did what He knew to be right. The threats of those in authority,

clothed with all the power of government, never caused Him to swerve a hair's breadth from the straight line of duty. When no one at Jerusalem cared or dared to cleanse the temple from mammon and restore it to spiritual service, He did it single-handed with a scourge of cords. When, standing under oath before the judges of the Sanhedrin, He knew that the confession of the truth as to who He was would nail Him to a Roman cross, without the slightest evasion He made it. He not only answered the question put to Him by the high priest, but lifted the curtain of the future that His august questioner might catch a glimpse of His future glory, majesty and power. But His cheeks that never paled before the face of clay, at times, through sympathy for others, were wet with tears. "Jesus wept." When we consider who He was, these two words are the sublimest utterance of all literature. He came to Bethany, where lived three of His dearest friends, Mary, Martha and Lazarus. But four days before, Lazarus had died; still He claimed that He could wake him out of his sleep. So He went with the grief-stricken sisters towards their brother's tomb, and His sympathy with them was so profound that it expressed itself in trickling tears.

We turn from this touching domestic scene to an exhibition of Jesus' sympathy national in its scope. He was going up to Jerusalem for the last time. He came to the brow of Olivet. The city beyond the valley of the Kedron was in full view—the city that had so often rejected and stoned to death God's prophets, and now had rejected Him, and was about to demand His crucifixion at the hands of the Gentiles. He, however, seemed quite oblivious to the crowning wrong and shame that He was so soon to suffer, and, without a thought of self, poured out the full tide of His sympathy on the doomed city. As He looked upon it, He could not suppress His tears.

His triumphal entry into it was just at hand. Already the rejoicing multitude was crying, "Hosanna to

the son of David: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest." Already they were strowing palm-branches and their loose-flowing robes in His pathway; but His ear was deaf to their praises and glad shouts of welcome, and His eye was blind to the splendid pageant. While the multitude rejoiced, He wept. He cried, "If thou hadst known in this day, even thou, the things which belong unto peace!" Jesus left that sentence unfinished; it ended in silent tears, more eloquent than words. After a little, recovering Himself, He added; "But now they are hid from thine eyes."

To be sure, in His cry we catch the note of fervid, national patriotism. As a Jewish citizen, if nothing more, the impending destruction of Jerusalem well nigh broke His heart. His emotional utterance brings to mind the plaintive words of the Jewish captives in Babylon:

"If I forget thee, O Jerusalem,  
Let my right hand forget her skill.  
Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth,  
If I remember thee not;  
If I prefer not Jerusalem  
Above my chief joy." (Ps. 137.)

But while the patriotic note is unmistakably heard in the cry of Jesus, it is but a sad undertone. The spiritual destruction of the people was the thought that pierced Him through and through. This is clear from His cognate cry, twice repeated. Comparatively early in His ministry, when, according to Luke, He was going up to Jerusalem, some Pharisees warned Him to get away, since Herod wished to kill Him. But in spite of the bloody threat, He determined to go on boldly with His work, saying that "it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem." Then overwhelmed with the thought of the inevitable destruction of the city, He cried; "O

Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto thee! how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her own brood under her wings, and ye would not." Here we see that it was the *spiritual* destruction of her "children" that stirred the deepest depths of His sympathy.

Once more the same cry burst from His lips. It was the last Passover week. Jesus was in Jerusalem. He delivered a remarkable address both to His disciples and to the Pharisees, unmasking the sins of the latter and appealing to His followers to avoid them. In this speech He pronounced upon the chief men of His nation seven woes so awful that they sound like seven thunders of divine judgment in the midst of His gospel of grace. But even these terrible words pulsated with His love. It was the last great effort of Christ to awaken the consciences of the Pharisees and win them to Himself, so the thunder of His wrath ended in a divine sob, as He cried "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem." He stood within the walls of the sacred city when He uttered for the second time these words. It was the headquarters of those whom He addressed and denounced to their faces. "Verily," He said, "all these things shall come upon this generation," and "thy children" is again the burden of His soul. That they should reject Him, their Saviour, for whose coming they had so long looked and perish in their unbelief, broke His heart.

But His matchless sympathy was not hemmed in by state boundaries. A great apostolic writer says that "in the days of his flesh," He "offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears, unto Him that was able to save Him from death." These words evidently portray the agony of Christ in Gethsemane. He had wept over Jerusalem, which was the life and heart of His nation; in the garden He now wept over a lost world. To save it He resigned Himself to death,

with all that that awful word signifies. His prayer, that He might be delivered from death, was answered in His complete submission to the divine will, which was the unmistakable undertone of every petition that He offered in Gethsemane, "not as I will, but as thou wilt."

Here, just before His death on the cross, we see how His overflowing sympathy encircled the globe, embracing all nations, kindreds and tongues. In the garden and on the cross the sin of our race pressed down on His heart like the superincumbent weight of a mountain. He sweat great drops of blood. He cried out, but it was the strong cry of perfect manhood. Tears coursed down His checks; they were the tears of the Son of God and of the Son of man, and they expressed the unbounded love of God for, and the unfathomable sympathy of God with, man.

But He Himself has given a far more profound expression of His tender, brooding sympathy with all men than has fallen from the lips or flowed from the pen of any of His apostles. He was consciously near the close of His earthly life. Gethsemane lay just before Him; a little beyond it was the cross. To His disciples He had more than once announced His death. They were bewildered and perplexed. Not apprehending the nature of His kingdom, His preannounced death seemed to them irretrievable disaster. He sat on the Mount of Olives. The disciples, filled with apprehension and fear, gathered around Him. Full of pity for them, He tried to enlighten them, to tell them what His Kingdom was and what His going away from them meant. He took them beyond the dispensation which by His ministry had been ushered in to the time when He shall come in His glory to judge all men. He drew before them a picture of the general judgment, so clear, so simple, so sublime that it has entered into and shaped the thought of the whole Christian era in reference to the future state of the righteous and the wicked. And the crown of His match-

less statement is the reply of the Judge to the humble righteous, who are unable to recall the good deeds that He declares they have done to Him. "Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me." He so completely identifies Himself with them, that he who feeds one of them feeds Him, he that clothes one of them clothes Him, he who takes a homeless one under his roof and cares for him, shelters and cares for Christ Himself; he who honors one of His brethren honors Him; he who neglects or despises one of them, even the least, neglects or despises Him.

But how is such identification effected? how brought about? Not by extinguishing personality, not by monism, which teaches that the universe, man and God are one substance; which so obliterates personality as to destroy personal responsibility and accountability. For while all monists are not pantheists, all monism is pantheism. But the great Teacher, while identifying Himself with His people, is still their Judge, and calls them to account for what they have, and have not done.

But what did Jesus mean by "my brethren"? what do these words include? None will doubt that Christ included in the phrase, "my brethren," His own followers. They bear His likeness, possess His spirit and by virtue of their regeneration or re-creation are His sons and daughters. The author of the epistle to the Hebrews probably had in mind the words of Jesus, on which we comment, when he wrote, "Both he that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are all of one; for which cause he," in His glorified state, "is not ashamed," or delights, "to call them brethren." Other Scriptures tell us that believers are in Christ and Christ is in them; so that whatever is done to them is done to Him. On this basis the glorified Saviour appealed to Saul of Tarsus, who was cruelly maltreating some of the early disciples, "Saul, Saul, why persecute thou me?"

But did not Christ include in the phrase, "my brethren," more than His undoubted followers? did he not designate by it all men? Those that may differ on this point still agree on some fundamental facts. They alike hold that God made man in His own image, and that, on the ground of spiritual likeness, man was God's child. But since man by sin lost his spiritual likeness to God and his fellowship with Him, he imperatively needs to be created anew by the Spirit. By this re-creation the sinner is restored to right relation to God, to likeness to God, to fellowship with God, to the glad recognition that God is his Father and the joyful consciousness that he is God's child. On the basis of creation man is a child of God, by his re-creation in Christ Jesus he is brought to see this, and to act in conformity to it. Jesus taught Nicodemus that when he should be born from above by the Spirit he then could see the kingdom of God; so a sinner by a spiritual rebirth or re-creation comes to see or apprehend that God is his Father and that he is God's child. But whether he apprehends it or not the fact remains that by creation man was made God's child and Christ's brother. If this be true, then the words of Christ, "my brethren," include not only regenerated and saved souls but all men.

This conclusion is greatly strengthened by the fact that Jesus claimed to be both the Son of God and the Son of man; identified with God on the one hand and with man on the other. In Matt. 25, when proclaiming the general judgment, He asserts that He, "the Son of man," is to be the judge of all men. When in conflict with the Pharisees, John 5, He made the same claim that He was to be the judge of all, and that His authority to execute judgment is based on the fact that "he is the Son of man." Having the nature of men, and being thereby identified with them, He is fitted to be their judge. It is in announcing His judgment of all men that He uses the phrase, "my brethren," making it strongly

probable that He included in it every individual of our race.

If by "my brethren" the disciples of Christ are alone meant, then if a man has compassion on a heathen, or on one depraved and vile in a Christian land, and helps him when in distress, his act of mercy cannot be adjudged as done to Christ, although it may be an act of greater charity, of profounder self-abnegation than if it had been expended on a lovable Christian. It may have required the very highest possible expression of love,—love to an enemy. To limit Christ's words, "my brethren," to His followers would exclude the Good Samaritan from the blessing of having done his compassionate work to the Lord. Nor can we forget that Jesus Himself was most deeply touched with the condition of the godless; His own countrymen, wandering from God without any true and competent teachers, aroused His deepest sympathy. It was *apostate* Jerusalem that broke up the fountain of His tears; a lost world wrung out His heart's blood in Gethsemane; and did He by the phrase, "my brethren," exclude all, who, like Him, weep over, and toil to save, the lost, from the ineffable blessing of being assured that they have done it unto Him? Shall Judson's years of sympathetic toil, before even one idolater savingly received his message, be regarded as not done to Christ, while what he thereafter did to his *saved* brother must be so regarded? Is it not more reasonable to place in the category of Christ's brethren all that wear the human form, and conclude that He regards whatever good we may do to mortal man as done to Him?

Growing out of this, how mighty is the motive to treat courteously, kindly, justly, yea more, to love, and to sympathize with, even the least, the most ignorant, the most depraved of our fellow men. Whatever we do to any one of them, we do to the eternal Lord of us all. How this matchless teaching of Jesus exalts man as

such! How inconceivably sacred it reveals man's person to be!

Now, if we make no mistake, the fact so clearly taught in the Scriptures that Christ through His sympathy and incarnation is identified with our race, solves in a reasonable, natural way some of the profoundest facts connected with our redemption.

First, Christ's suffering, since He was sinless, has always been a baffling mystery. On the surface of things, so far as our observation and experience extend, sin and suffering are always indissolubly yoked together. Where men are most intensely selfish and corrupt, where they most unconstrainedly indulge their bodily appetites and passions, and, regardless of the rights and happiness of others, seek their ambitious ends, there, other things being equal, is the greatest suffering. Where there is most of purity, the largest benevolence, where men most generally seek the highest good and greatest happiness of one another, there is the profoundest peace and the most exultant joy.

But while such general statements are unquestionably true, they make no distinction between physical and mental distress, between aching nerves and the anguish of the soul. There is, to say the least, bodily suffering where there is no sin. So far as we know, beasts do not and cannot sin, but they suffer physically. They fight and tear each other with tooth and claw, and devour each other. Men maim and slay them. Outside of their cruel interneccine strifes, man inflicts upon them their greatest distresses. Nor is their suffering wholly physical; they also suffer through fear. Affrighted they flee at the approach of their enemies, whether they be stronger beasts or unpitying men. If they suffer in mind anything more than fear, we cannot ascertain it. At all events, apart from sin, here is suffering, whose metes and bounds we cannot very clearly discern.

Moreover, infants suffer. To be sure they are bound up with our sinful race. To them, by the inexorable law of heredity, is imparted the taint of, and the tendency to, sin. But they have not voluntarily transgressed any law. And while they are unlike God, they are not responsible for it. They have no guilt, yet they suffer. Like animals they have both physical distress and fear, and sometimes grieve on account of neglect. Beyond this we cannot trace their suffering.

Frankly and fully taking into account these incontrovertible facts in reference to the suffering of sinless beasts and guiltless infants, we will now examine, as thoroughly as we can, the vast and difficult subject of the sufferings of the spotless Christ.

We first naturally turn to His temptations or trials arising from poverty, hunger, thirst and weariness, from the artfully seductive suggestions of the devil, from ambition, from unjust and cruel usage, and from the bitter taunts of His insolent foes. He was, says the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, "one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." (Heb-4:15) "For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." (2:18)

To these ordinary trials of Jesus, we must add the manifold woes and distresses of men, taken up by Him through sympathy into His perfect mind and heart. While we, on account of the deadening by sin of our moral sensibilities, can, at the best but partially feel the miseries of others, He, the immaculate Christ, through sympathy felt them in all their fulness and keenness. With this fact in mind let us reverently look in upon the mystery of Christ's agony in Gethsemane.

The first thing that arrests our attention is that His suffering was not physical, except so far as His body suffered through its vital connection with His mind. No hard hand of violence had yet been laid upon Him. To-

ward midnight, He went to the garden or park with the eleven. As He entered it, He felt within His soul the mysterious, rising, surging tides of woe. When in great mental distress, men often desire to be alone, or with those with whom they are in closest intimacy. Jesus therefore said to His disciples, "Sit ye here, while I go yonder and pray." Already His distress was so acute that He felt that He could be relieved only by pouring His bursting heart into the infinite, compassionate heart of His Father. But also craving human sympathy, He chose three disciples, in whom He probably most confided, to go with Him farther into the garden, where they might be beyond ear-shot of the rest. As they walked on these disciples saw, even in the moonlight, that the face of their Lord was clouded with inexpressible sadness, that His eyes betokened strange amazement, and that He was sorely troubled. He evidently marked their anxious solicitude for Him and, in explanation of the woeful expression of His face, said, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." Then longing for human sympathy on the one hand and for divine help on the other, He said to the three disciples, "Abide ye here and watch with me;" then He "went forward a little," and falling on His face, prayed, "My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt." He thus poured out His soul three times, returning, at the close of both the first and second agonizing petitions to the three disciples, to whom He appealed for sympathy. His agony of spirit was unprecedented, marvelous, matchless. His body betokened it. As He prayed, Luke says, "his sweat became as it were great drops of blood, falling down upon the ground."

How can we account for such excruciating suffering of soul in the spotless Son of God? Some have taken the superficial ground that He shrank with unutterable horror from death on a Roman cross; that in view of it He

agonized in prayer, shed bitter tears and sweat blood. There is not, however, a scintilla of evidence in the Gospels that He ever feared mere physical death. Such a view makes a coward of Him, makes Him in sturdy manhood less than hosts even of His weakest disciples, who, out of fidelity to Him, have endured deaths more painful than that of the cross, without complaint or even a tremor, yea more, sometimes with songs of triumph on their lips. Such a baseless, unworthy view of our Lord need not further detain us.

Moreover, in explanation of Jesus' agony in the garden conscience is of course excluded. When, with an unclouded mind, a wicked man approaches death, his past life, deeply stained by sin, stands vividly before him. Conscience wakes from its torpor and stings him; remorse bites him. He begins to feel the gnawings of the worm that dies not, the withering touch of the unquenchable fire. But Jesus was sinless. He never prayed for forgiveness, because He did not need it. He claimed that He always did what pleased the Father. He had no regret for any thought that He had ever cherished, for any word that He had ever spoken, nor for any deed that He had ever done. He looked back over a life of wonderful beneficence. He had opened blind eyes, unstopped deaf ears, loosed dumb tongues, straightened crippled limbs, cleansed loathed lepers, cast out demons, raised the dead, dried the tears of mourners, and preached to the neglected and despised poor the good news of God's love to all men, even to the meanest of them. Yet, while knowing His absolute integrity, and having the unmistakable approval of His conscience and of His Father, His suffering in Gethsemane was so great, that no finite intellect can fathom it. The only possible solution of it, it seems to me, is found in Christ's identification with our race. His sympathy with us was so profound and so absolutely perfect that He felt, as though they were His own, our sharpest distresses. The

culmination of His suffering in Gethsemane was death. He said, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." But what did He mean by death?

In whatever order of being death occurs, we find that it is a separation. When a plant dies, what we call its life, known only by its manifestation, is separated from the root, stalk and leaf, which consequently wither and decay. When an animal dies life is separated from its flesh, blood and bones, which then soon crumble to dust. In the same way man as animal dies; but he is both material and spiritual, has both body and soul; is linked on the one hand to the beasts that perish, and on the other hand to God. As spirit he is made to live in fellowship with God. But when he sins his union with God ceases. He is separated from Him, and that separation is spiritual death, death in its essence; and that death is the penalty of sin. When, therefore, Christ declared that He was sorrowful even unto death, He spoke of spiritual death, sorrowful even unto separation from God; sorrowful because through His divine sympathy He began to feel the awfulness of that separation; began to know by experience the fearful misery of the transgressor, suffering the penalty due to sin. Back from such an experience He shrank with "strong crying and tears," and in inconceivable agony prayed that that cup, if it were possible, might pass away from Him.

But Gethsemane and the cross are halves of one sphere. Christ's experience in the garden reaches its climax on Calvary. In the one we have His sorrow even unto death, unto separation from God, on the other His appalling cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Did God forsake Him? He never forsakes any soul that sincerely seeks Him, however imperfect and unworthy that soul may be. Much less did He forsake His only begotten Son, who was one with Him and always perfectly did His will. How then shall we interpret this amazing, despairing cry of Christ?

He was our elder brother; He had our nature and our experiences, yet without sin. And He had also entered into a profounder and more intimate union with mankind than most Christian thinkers of the ages have ever seemed to conceive. His sympathy with men, lost in sin, was perfect. His heart was the infinite heart of God. He was capable of taking up into it all the woes of our sinful race. And in His unbounded compassion He did not fail to enter fully into the awful experience of those, made to live in fellowship with God, who yet were separated from Him by their transgressions. Through His divine sympathy with them, He felt within His own soul all their woe. And when on His cross He cried, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" we hear in those awful words the wail of a lost race.

Now, the only possible sense in which the sinless Christ could bear the sins of men is that He voluntarily bore the penalty justly due to sin. And this penalty was not laid upon Him from without. We have no evidence of any mechanical arrangement between the persons of the triune God, that one should mete out the penalty of sin, and that another, called the second person of the Trinity, should receive it. On the contrary, in the most natural manner, as the spontaneous outflow of His love for men and of His identifying sympathy with them, He fully felt in Himself, on their behalf, the awful reality of their spiritual death.

This view furnishes the most reasonable explanation of the atonement. Christ, by His sympathetic suffering, revealed, as He could have done in no other way, the depth and tenderness of the divine love for sinful men. On the other hand, His soul-suffering even unto death, flowing from His perfect sympathy with lost men, proclaims in tones clear and terrible the awfulness and ineffable hatefulness of sin. It cost the sympathetic, sinless Son of God the pangs of spiritual death. All the hollow depths of hell seem to resound in Christ's ap-

palling cry on the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Separation from God—all that there is, or can be, in perdition is wrapped up in that. Forsaken of God—hell is only that "writ large." And that is the bitter fruit of sin.

The intensity of Christ's suffering for us through sympathy is confirmed by modern scientific investigation, which has shown that Christ probably died not from the tortures of the cross but from the violence of emotion, that literally ruptured the walls of His heart and filled the pericardium with blood. This theory alone explains the extravasated blood, separated into red clot and watery serum, that poured from His side when pierced with a spear. Moreover this is consonant with the suddenness of His death, which at the time puzzled and amazed the Roman authorities. Those crucified usually lived from twelve hours to two or three days, but Christ died in six hours. And when death came He was still physically strong, as is shown by His loud cry just before He bowed His head and gave up the ghost. He died not from pain of body, but from anguish of spirit. Through sympathy He took the agony of a sinful world up into His soul. In the language of prophecy He could say, "The reproaches of them that reproach thee are fallen on me," "Reproach hath broken my heart." (Ps. 69:9,20.) (See Dr. Stroud's treatise, "On the Physical Cause of the Death of Christ," also Hanna's "The Life of our Lord." V. p. 323 and Appendix.)

It may be objected that this view of Christ's atonement robs it of one of its essential elements; that the Scriptures represent Him as suffering for us or on our behalf; that one may suffer sympathetically *with* another without suffering *for* Him. True, the Bible does clearly teach that Christ suffered *for* us, yea more, that he suffered vicariously for us. But cannot one at the same time both suffer with and for another? If one suffers with another in distress, does not that fact cheer

and help him who is in distress? Does not suffering with another naturally culminate in suffering for another?

A few years ago, a man strolling along the shore of Lake Michigan, at Jackson Park, Chicago, went into the lake for a bath. He soon began to struggle in the water and lustily called for help. A crowd hurriedly gathered on the beach, but no one dared to go into those treacherous waters. The man sank, but just as he rose again to the surface, a student of the university came on the run to the rescue. He quickly flung away hat, coat and shoes, and boldly plunging in, swam straight to the drowning stranger. The large company on the shore was as still as a stone. The anxiety was intense lest the man now frantically struggling for his life should instinctively grasp his would-be deliverer and both should go down to death beneath the waves. But the student cautiously kept the half-drowned man at arm's length, and slowly brought him on toward the shore. The moment that the rescuer and the rescued stood upright in shallow water, the crowd that had waited seemingly an age in breathless silence, broke out into glad huzzas that made the welkin ring, and in their joyful excitement threw their caps, hats and coats high up into the air. Why? They had simply witnessed an act of vicarious suffering. One man had sympathized with another, whose life was in imminent peril, and out of sympathy for him had exposed himself to the same peril. His sympathy with him expressed itself in an heroic deed for him. He voluntarily thrust himself into the jaws of death that he might snatch his fellow man from them.

A man on a certain Board of Trade was downcast and almost in despair because he could not meet his note of \$25,000 in the bank, which must be paid by two o'clock in the afternoon or his credit would be utterly destroyed. A member of the Board, whose business standing was flawless, deeply sympathizing with his brother trader,

lifted the burden off from him by putting his name upon the despairing man's paper. He took his place, suffered in his stead, paid his debt, and saved him from financial ruin. Here again sympathizing with led to doing for.

It is always so, where sympathy is genuine. Jesus in His peerless parable says, that the Samaritan, when he came to the unfortunate Jew, who had been robbed, stripped and beaten into insensibility, had compassion on him, sympathized with him, and that sympathy at once expressed itself in outward and helpful act on behalf of the sufferer. So the Chief of good Samaritans sympathized, suffered with us, who had been robbed and deeply wounded by sin, and His divine sympathy so identified Him with us that He felt within Himself in all its dread reality the penalty justly due to our sin. He sympathized with us and hence died *for* us.

But the notion that God ever suffers, some scholarly thinkers reject with apparent horror. In their view suffering is an attribute of imperfection, is either an accompaniment of immaturity, like the growing pains of children, or the direct effect of personal sin, and so cannot be predicated of God.

Of course God is neither immature nor sinful, nor does He suffer from such causes. But the suffering that we attribute to Him, flows from His absolute perfection; suffering that is the inevitable concomitant of His unspeakable love for, and boundless sympathy with, those that are in distress. That God must thus suffer we infer from the universal experience and observation of men. One who can look without pity and pain on the sufferings of others, is always unhesitatingly pronounced heartless. Is God as unfeeling as the worst of our race? Those who feel most acutely the manifold miseries of men and hasten to alleviate them, are universally regarded as the very noblest of the earth. Suffering that arises from our sympathy with those in distress is not a proof of imperfection of character, but rather of char-

acter reaching up toward that of God Himself. In Christ, in whom was the Godhead bodily, we have the highest known example of sympathetic suffering, and His suffering instead of proving Him imperfect, exalted Him to the throne of the universe. Having, through sympathy with lost men, suffered, on their behalf, the pangs of spiritual death, "God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name." (Phil. 2:9)

But some, who emphatically affirm that suffering is utterly incompatible with any true conception of God, still hold to the deity of Christ, and admit of course, as every intelligent Christian man must, that He suffered and suffered for us. But to steer clear of the notion of a suffering God, they fall back on the two natures of Christ, the divine and the human. To Christ's human nature they ascribe His suffering, while the divine nature, without the slightest touch of pain or compassion, holds up the human so that it can drink the cup of woe to the dregs and perfect the work of atonement for the sinner. All this is well and devoutly meant, and should be so considered. But in all that Christ said and did, as it is reported in the New Testament, we have no hint that the human and divine natures in Him acted thus separately and independently. There is no evidence that He had two consciousnesses, the human and the divine. According to the evangelists the one indivisible Christ acted, said this and that, did this and that. Moreover, the apostles, who, guided by the Spirit, still further unfolded and interpreted the gospel for us, do not sever the personality of Christ so that the human and divine in Him stand over against each other. That both the Gospels and Epistles teach the undivided personality of Jesus is sustained by the ripest modern scholarship.

That God, through sympathy with His people, sufferers, is strongly re-enforced by many declarations of the Old Testament, scattered from Genesis to Zechariah.

When, before the flood, the race became very corrupt, it "grieved" Jehovah "at his heart." (Gen. 6:6) He saw the affliction of His people in Egypt, heard their cry, knew their sorrows and came down to deliver them. (Ex. 3:7-8). In the time of the Judges, Jehovah's "soul was grieved for the misery of Israel." (Judgs. 10:16). In Isaiah (63:9) it is declared that Jehovah "was afflicted in all his people's affliction." Jehovah's cry over Ephraim, through the lips of Hosea (11:8), ending in the words, "My heart is turned within me, my compassions are kindled together," shows how deeply His soul was pained on account of Israel's incorrigible rebellion against Him. And we learn from Zechariah that the Lord was identified with His ancient people, "He that toucheth you, toucheth the apple of his," Jehovah's "eye." (Zech. 2:8). No wonder that George Adam Smith in his exposition of Isaiah devotes an entire chapter to "The Passion of God."

But some say these are merely anthropomorphisms. Most of the representations of God in the Bible are. "Our Father, who art in heaven" is one; "The Lord is my shepherd" is another; but the real question is What do these anthropomorphisms mean? What do they tell us about God? Do they misrepresent Him? If Christ does not misrepresent Him then they do not. The same Jehovah that cried over His people in Babylon through the lips of His prophet,

"Like a woman in travail I gasp,  
Pant and palpitate together," (Smith's Isaiah, Vol. II, p. 134) wept over Jerusalem, and agonized over a world in Gethsemane.

And the crowning consideration on this point is that no man, during all the ages, ever longed for an unsympathetic, passionless God. From such an unfeeling God, men universally recoil. Being infinite in holiness and power they tremble in His presence, but cannot love Him. With tricky, sinful Jacob they cry, "Jehovah is

in this place." "How dreadful is this place!" A God who fills men with cowering fear and shuddering dread, who cannot sympathize or suffer with them in their deep distress, even though their woes are but the just retribution for their sins, cannot be the true God. Although some men under the old dispensation caught clear glimpses of Jehovah and of His love and sympathy, not till Christ came did "the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in its wings." (Mal. 4:2) "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish but have eternal life," is the sweetest song ever heard on earth. The loving, sympathetic God, the true God, was in Christ. What Christ did, He did. What Christ suffered, He suffered. Christ, God in Christ, took up into His heart of infinite tenderness all our sorrows, and felt them with us even unto death. To Him men, even when half awake to spiritual realities, are irresistibly drawn.

During Christ's earthly ministry, Luke tells us (15:1) that publicans and sinners kept coming to Him to hear Him. They knew that He abhorred their sins, but in spite of that they were attracted to His person and loved to hear His words. They did not know that He was God in their own flesh, but they felt that they stood in the presence of one who understood them and whose sympathy overflowed to them; so in spite of the protests of the Pharisees, the acknowledged leaders of the people, they kept coming to Jesus. Neither their sins nor their rulers could keep them away from Him. The true, sympathetic God allures and satisfies men. The supreme need of the world is to know Him.

But can a suffering Saviour be happy? men ask. Pain or suffering is not in itself an evil but a beneficent agent for the good of men. It is often a kindly warning against sinful excesses, which, if persisted in, bring men prematurely to death. It is also a moral discipline by which men are unfolded into virtue. In suffering one

learns how to let patience have her perfect work, that he may reach that state of perfection in which he shall lack nothing. Even Christ learned by suffering how to be our "merciful and faithful high priest." It is also an expression of our heavenly Father's love, and when endured with resignation to the divine will brings forth in us "the fruit of righteousness." To begin at the lowest point, physical suffering and happiness are not incompatible. Christian invalids, along whose quivering nerves pain runs with blistering feet, often have deep down in their hearts the peace of God that passes all understanding. The peace and even joy of the martyrs, when enduring the most excruciating physical tortures, have been not only unruffled but enhanced. Moreover, even mental suffering has been unable to drive happiness from the soul that unwaveringly trusts in God. Innumerable times Christian men, smarting under baseless slander,

"Whose edge is sharper than the sword, whose tongue  
Outvenoms all the worms of Nile,"

(*Cymbeline III, Sc. 4.*)

have still been serene and happy. Now the most exquisite of all suffering is that which flows from our sympathy with those in distress, and such sufferers, by common consent, are the happiest of mortals. And if this be true in the case of imperfect men, it is also unquestionably true in the case of God. Our divine Lord who suffers sympathetically with us is at the same time filled with unfathomable peace and happiness unalloyed.

These objections answered, this then is the sum of our contention: Christ, on account of what He is and did, made it possible for every man to be reconciled to God. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." Through His infinite love, boundless sympathy and incarnation He identified Himself with our race; took up into Himself all our distresses and felt in all its fulness

and sharpness our chief woe, separation from God on account of our voluntary transgression. The sinless Saviour thus endured with us and for us death, the penalty of sin, bore it in His own body on the tree, satisfied in Himself every demand of His own law on the sinner, and exhibited, as He could have done in no other way, the limitless love of God to sinful men, and the awfulness and unspeakable hatefulness of sin. And all this—and here is the emphasis—as the natural, spontaneous outflow of His love for us and His unfathomable, tender sympathy with us.

## LUTHER RICE AND HIS PLACE IN AMERICAN BAPTIST HISTORY.

BY PROFESSOR E. B. POLLARD, D.D.,  
CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

### PART II.

This leads us to Rice's third notable contribution to denominational thought. Rice, as had no other, taught Baptists to think of their task in terms of leadership. Till the nineteenth century, Baptists imported many of their leaders from England and Wales.\* He saw quickly and clearly that if Baptists would keep at the front in the task of saving the world, they must be educated, and develop a well-equipped ministry. Other American Baptist leaders had, to be sure, seen this prior to the coming of Rice. Edwards (Morgan) and Eaton and Manning and Furman and Staughton had been thinking and working to this end. But it was Rice, who, in the most persistent and concrete way, bore this thought hard upon the consciences of the masses of the people. Through the missionary enterprise, he came to perceive distinctly that the coming task of the ministry of the land called for a broad outlook upon life and duty, and for the well-trained mind, if the Kingdom of God was to go forward victoriously. Well-furnished missionaries were the call of the hour, as well as ministers at home, capable of educating the people to the larger view of the Kingdom. In Rice's tours on behalf of foreign missions, he was struck with the fact that the multitudes sometimes responded more readily to the appeal than did the pastors themselves. An educated ministry now appeared to him the *crux* of the problem. While advocating education in general and the

\* About one-third of the first Triennial Convention were natives of Great Britain.

establishment of local centers of learning, his plan was that there should be at least one central institution, chiefly theological in character, for the whole people. This was projected in Philadelphia by the election of Dr. William Staughton and Rev. Ira Chase as the faculty of the first theological seminary for American Baptists, in the year 1818. In the year 1820, the number of theological students in attendance there was eighteen. In accordance with Rice's views, in order that the institution should be made most helpful to all sections, it was removed to Washington City in 1821. Here legal difficulties prevented the chartering of a purely theological school, and a college of academic character was instituted, with a theological department. Besides, experience had already shown that the young men entering the ministry needed college education quite as sorely as theological instruction, and there was then no school of college grade under Baptist auspices south of Rhode Island. Rhode Island College (Brown University) alone was of high grade. Rice proceeded to Washington, brought together the local leaders—notably, O. B. Brown, Spencer H. Cone and Enoch Reynolds—purchased land and presented it to the next meeting of the Triennial Convention, in 1820, "to promote the education of the ministry, and ultimately for the formation of a college, under the direction of the Baptist General Convention." While some of the more conservative brethren gasped at the bold stroke of Rice, the convention adapted its constitution so as to include the project, and passed resolutions accepting the proposed plans and site. Thus Columbian College came into being—begun by Rice and adopted by the Triennial Convention as their own. Rice felt in duty bound, and as agent of the convention was instructed, to collect the funds necessary to set the College firmly on its feet. At once he met with most gratifying and unexpected success. Money was freely given. The buildings were soon under way. The very progress being made became a cause of alarm among the more timid. But in February, 1821, the theological

department was opened, by the removal of the faculty and students which had already been brought together in Philadelphia. In the fall of 1822, the College opened its doors.

But Columbian College was only the beginning of the educational campaign pushed vigorously by Rice. While it would be folly to attribute to him the glory of the founding of the large number of educational institutions which came into being among Baptists within the brief period of the decade or more of Rice's enthusiastic agitation, yet it can be truthfully said that out of the awakenings in which Rice was the most active personal participant, there originated Hamilton, 1819; Waterville (Colby), 1820; Columbian, 1821-22; Newton Theological Institution, 1825; Furman, 1827; Georgetown, 1829; Richmond, 1832; Wake Forest, 1834; Granville (Denison), 1832, Alton (Shurtleff), 1832.

Professor H. T. Cook, in his volume, "A Biography of R. Furman," brings out the denomination's great debt to Dr. Richard Furman for leadership in education, especially ministerial education among Baptists in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. But as his biographer states, "His was the Fabian policy of waiting, waiting, waiting on his brethren." After the American Revolution, the Charleston Association had come to the front as the leader in ministerial education, as the Philadelphia Association had led before the Revolution; and Dr. Furman was the foremost exponent of the idea. He had undoubtedly sown very much of the seed which was later gloriously harvested. Dr. Furman, a native of New York State, who had spent his entire mature life in the South, was at the very beginning recognized as the most suitable man for the presidency of the General Missionary Convention organized in Philadelphia in 1814. He had been in the service longer than the large majority of those who composed that first meeting. They were, for the most part, comparatively young men. Furman was a conservative, mediating spirit, as well as a leader of large expe-

rience. The first definite proposal for a general movement of Baptists, in the direction of an institution for ministerial education, through the Triennial Convention, was made by Dr. Furman in a presidential address to that body in 1817. But it is evident that the conservatism of the president was too slow for the dashing young spirits whose progressiveness and enthusiasm dominated the convention. At the meeting in 1820, Robert B. Semple was substituted for Furman in the presidency, and the educational plans of Rice were accepted and endorsed. If Furman's policy was Fabian, Rice's was Napoleonic. The question whether Furman or Rice deserves the greater credit for the remarkable educational advance among Baptists in the twenties and early thirties, resolves itself into the question whether the man who suggests plans, or the man who executes should have the greater praise. All honor to Furman for his long sustained influence in favor of ministerial education. Rice thought the time had come to act. He agitated to that end, and made a dash toward achievement, rallying the Baptist hosts to advance. As Arthur H. Clough wrote concerning Columbus:

"What if wise men as far back as Ptolemy  
Judged that the earth like an orange is round!  
None of them ever said, 'Come along, follow me,  
Sail to the West, and the East shall be found.' "

Rice launched out into the deep, and left many less daring spirits upon the shore. From the year 1817 (when the convention decided to take education as well as missions into its program) till about 1825, there was every indication of Rice's signal triumph in the founding of the central institution at Washington, and in the hearty awakening of the Baptist brotherhood to its enthusiastic support. There were vigorous protests, to be sure, as there had been earlier concerning the missionary aggressiveness of Rice and his co-laborers, who were directing

the policy of the Convention, but both the Board annually and the Convention triennially endorsed Rice's movements in words of the most enthusiastic praise. For example, in 1822, in their Eighth Annual Report, the Board made this minute: "Brother Rice is again unanimously and with the glow of affectionate gratitude, elected agent of the Board, and commended to the care of a gracious providence, and to the bounteous attention of all who take pleasure in well doing."

Among other educative forces which Rice fostered for Baptists was the missionary periodical literature. The Baptist Missionary Magazine had been established as organ of the Boston Missionary Society in 1803, but Rice saw yet larger possibilities in the printed page, and so promoted first *The Latter-Day Luminary*, 1818, and then the *Columbian Star*, 1819, under the auspices of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions. From the latter came the *Christian Index*, the oldest of the Baptist weeklies having continuous existence. The *Religious Herald* and the *Biblical Recorder* were products of the same movement. All the earliest periodicals established by American Baptists were of home missionary character; and the new foreign mission movement gave great impetus to the printed page as a medium of communication and impulse.

Rice also began to issue tracts for missionary purposes and became the first treasurer of the Baptist General Tract Society, which was organized with headquarters in the office of the *Columbian Star*, February 25, 1824. Later the organization was removed to Philadelphia, and became the American Baptist Publication Society.

The circulation of helpful books was another of Mr. Rice's methods of diffusing good. Says Dr. Rufus Babcock (*Sprague's Annals of the American Baptist Pulpit*, p. 605): "His earnest advocacy of the circulation of excellent books, especially such memoirs as those of Mr. Judson, Mr. Boardman, and Andrew Fuller, in which also he personally engaged—thus antedating by several years

the work of colportage in our land, deserves special mention in this connection, as indicating an intelligent appreciation of what the exigencies of the country and the age demanded." Rice's impress upon the organized or associational life of American Baptists was marked.

In the present generation, and for years past, it has become a familiar saying among Baptists that the association is a purely missionary body—word *missionary* being interpreted freely, to include education, and other causes that make for individual and social uplift. But for one hundred years prior to 1814, Baptist associations were not missionary bodies except incidentally. They were formed for mutual intercourse, for fellowship, and general helpfulness among the churches which composed them. Rice was the greatest single agency for converting all the Baptist associations into missionary bodies. One may properly enquire why he at first organized missionary societies which covered the territory already occupied by associations. The answer is probably to be found in the fact that it seemed easier at that juncture in the denominational life, to gather persons of missionary spirit into a new society than to swing unitedly into line organizations which had been banded together for other than missionary purposes. Among the more influential associations, that of Charleston alone seems to have acted directly, or rather through its own general committee. The Philadelphia Association, while sympathetic, recommended the organization of the "Philadelphia Baptist Society for Foreign Missions." Such an impulse did Rice give to the missionary idea that it was soon discerned that a Baptist association could have no higher task than that of missions, and so the "associations" gradually absorbed the "societies," except, of course, those connected with the local churches.

Rice encouraged the women to take part in missionary and educational activity as never before. The winsomeness and ability of Anne Haseltine, the first Mrs. Judson,

contributed not a little to the calling out of the energies of the Baptist women. Yet there was, in many quarters, strong opposition to feminine activity in the work of the Kingdom. Wherever Rice went he encouraged the sisters to organize, and many "Female Missionary Societies," and "Female Educational Societies" were formed in all parts of the territory covered by his labors. Woman's place in organized missionary life became a fixture. There could be no steps backward. So, too, when in 1815, a Mrs. White, a pious young widow, member of the Sansom St. Church, Philadelphia, of which Rice was also a member, proposed to give her life as missionary to India, and her appointment was vigorously opposed on the ground that the Scriptures forbade women to speak and teach, Rice favored her appointment, and she became our first woman missionary, other than the wives of appointees.

It is impossible to record the number of individuals upon whom Rice's striking personality made a deep impression for good. Had he done nothing else than be the agent under God in sending out John Mason Peck to be our greatest Baptist home missionary, that would have entitled Rice to a crown of rejoicing; for it was in Peck's labors and in his brain (together with that of Jonathan Going) that the American Baptist Home Mission Society was formed in 1832. Peck—whom Vedder, in his "Short History of the Baptists," p. 325, puts in the same class with Judson and Boardman for heroic service—freely accords to Luther Rice an important, decisive and formative influence in his career. (See Babcock's "Life of Peck," pp. 49 ff.)

Among the greatest of American Baptists stands Francis Wayland. The following paragraph from his biography (written by his sons, p. 53), gives to Rice the credit of being the prime agency in his conversion and of the direction of his life to the higher Christian service:

"About this time (1816), Rev. Luther Rice visited Troy to awaken an interest in missions. He staid with

my father, and preached several times in the Baptist Church. The work of missions and the scheme of subjecting the world to Christ, presented by one who had just returned from a heathen land, had all the effect of novelty. To me the subject had an intensity of interest which has never left me to the present moment. Mr. Rice was a man of decided ability, and a solemn and effective preacher. But in addition to this he was a man who had given up all for Christ, burning with zeal to preach the gospel to the heathen and appearing among us for the sole purpose of collecting means to carry on and extend this work. He was the only American who had gone out into the darkness of paganism and had returned to tell us what existed there. I remember well the effect produced on me by a sermon which he preached from the text: "The glorious gospel of the blessed God." For the first time in my life I was constrained to believe that the sentiments of my heart were in harmony with the gospel; that I loved God and all that God loved, and that it would be a pleasure to me to devote all my life to his service."

This is but a sample of the many instances of profound religious impression exerted by Luther Rice upon individuals who became prominent in Christian service during the first half of the nineteenth century. He gathered about him in the early days at Columbian, a number of exceptional young men, who caught the contagion of his enthusiasm for education and missions. Among these may be mentioned Rufus Babcock, first tutor in Columbian College, president of Waterville College, president of American Baptist Publication Society, corresponding secretary of the American and Foreign Bible Society; Baron Stow, editor of the Columbian Star, scholar and eloquent preacher; J. D. Knowles, editor of the Christian Review, biographer of Ann Haseltine Judson, and professor in Newton Theological Institution; Robert E. Pattison, president of Waterville College, professor in Newton, Shurtleff and Chicago; and not least, T. J. Conant, a scholar pre-eminent among Baptists. Rice ardently sym-

pathized with student life everywhere, and was, so far as we are aware, the first to institute a regular season of "prayer for colleges." (Taylor's Memoir, p. 241.)

Rice's success in stimulating the religious work among colored people of the South is worthy of mention. "African Missionary Societies" were organized in numerous places. Out of this movement emerged one of the greatest Negroes the South has produced—if, indeed, there has ever been a greater representative of that race in Christian service at any time. We refer to Lott Cary, a Richmond slave, who purchased his freedom, became a power for good in his native city; was recognized and loved by all; became the first missionary to Africa of African blood. It was during Rice's campaign in Virginia in 1815 that Lott Cary had his attention turned to missions on the continent of his forefathers. The Richmond African Missionary Society was formed, which contributed annually one hundred to one hundred and fifty dollars to the Baptist General Convention. Said Cary, "I am an African . . . and I feel bound to labor for my suffering race." The General Convention sent him out as missionary in 1820. He became one of the original settlers of the colony at Monrovia; and when he died in 1828, he was acting governor of Liberia.

As a preacher, Luther Rice had ability of the highest order. His tall, portly, well-proportioned figure gave the appearance of strength. His voice was impressive and reached well the remotest auditor. He studied thoroughly his subjects, and is said to have been unusually free from the repetition which might easily have characterized one who lived much in the saddle, and journeyed from place to place continually. His sermons and addresses were delivered with much fervor, and at times, great pathos.

In private homes he was a benediction; engaging with the family in private devotions, starting up some familiar hymn, reading the Scriptures, and leading in fervent prayer. The truth is, Rice seemed to be forever at his Master's business—pointing individuals to Christ, encouraging some young man to devote his life to Christian

service, preaching, speaking, exhorting. On a visit to Lynn, Mass.—the city where John Clarke, of Newport, and two other Baptists were, in 1651, severely handled for trying to establish a preaching station—Mr. Rice brought together a Baptist church, which we believe has survived to this day. There are repeated accounts of his deep solicitude for the spiritual welfare of Washington City, and of his religious work in the interest of government officials there.

Well did Dr. W. H. Whitsitt (Review of Dr. Vedder's History of the Baptists of the Middle States, 1899) declare: "The coming of Luther Rice was the most important event in Baptist history in the nineteenth century. We have never been able hitherto to estimate correctly the proportions of this extraordinary person. He was the magician of American Baptist life. Mr. Rice moved his wand and almost in an instant the scattered Baptist churches in the United States were changed into a Baptist denomination. At his instigation the General Convention of the Baptist denomination for Foreign Missions was organized in 1814, when possibly for the first time the title 'Denomination' was officially applied to our people. Nothing is so great as a great man. Mr. Rice introduced the enterprise of foreign missions among American Baptists. Mr. Rice established Columbian College and gave an impulse to education in all parts of the country. Mr. Rice was closely connected with the origin of the Publication Society. Likewise he imparted a momentum to the Baptist press which it has never lost. As a result of his activity State conventions sprang up in many quarters to promote the cause of missions, and in a few years the constitution of the Baptist denomination was changed in a marvellous fashion. Finally, Mr. Rice became the occasion of a widespread schism between Baptists of the 'old school' and Missionary Baptists. . . . American Baptists have never yet done justice to the colossal figure of that extraordinary man."

If it be fair to attribute to Luther Rice so large a place in the history of American Baptists, it is quite natural to inquire why his contribution to their life has been so obscured, and so tardy of recognition. To answer this question, it is necessary to advert to the contemporary criticisms which Rice received and the mistakes and disasters which so marred his otherwise brilliant career. It should be recalled that there were a few, a very few—though some of these were prominent—who from the very beginning took occasion to find fault with Rice and his policies. Probably this was to be expected, as he was called to a very difficult task, and his labors and abilities gave him, as a new comer, an unusual degree of prominence. Before Rice appeared upon the scenes, a bitter feud, most unseemly among brethren, had sprung up and was being waged between Henry Holcombe and William Staughton, Philadelphia pastors, and two of the most prominent Baptists of the day. Staughton was an Englishman, of large talent and learning, who had come to America at the call of Dr. Richard Furman for a suitable pastor for the church at Georgetown, S. C. From South Carolina, Staughton came north, and at length settled in Philadelphia, as pastor of the First Baptist Church, and later of the church in Sansom Street. Henry Holcombe, a native of Virginia, came to Philadelphia from Georgia, in 1812, to be Staughton's successor in the First Church. Almost from the beginning there was friction and misunderstanding between these two leading pastors. The antagonism showed itself in the very first meeting of the General (Triennial) Convention. The breach widened and appeared in all the general work of the denomination. It almost disrupted the Philadelphia Association. It is not necessary to go into the unfortunate details of this controversy; but the student of this period must discern that Luther Rice became the innocent victim of shafts forged in a controversy for which he was in no way responsible. Philadelphia was selected as the seat of the Convention's activities. Staughton's

side was in the ascendant. Rice coöperated with the majority, united with Staughton's church (after Holcombe had criticized him for not joining a church in America). He became the target of Holcombe's biting criticism continually. Rice's motives for becoming a Baptist were impugned. Think of it! His decision to remain in the United States as agent among the churches, at the instance of the Convention, longer than the critics thought he should, was condemned. It was even charged that his salary was too large. But Rice, with remarkable equanimity, went steadily about his task, travelling from one end of the eastern seaboard to the other, and as far west as Tennessee and Kentucky, advocating missions with an eloquence rarely, if ever, equalled; organizing missionary societies, and collecting funds for the mission. For all this he received the munificent salary of *eight dollars a week*. And most of this he turned back into the treasury for missionary and educational purposes. But then, as now, many can be aroused to hostility by raising the cry of expenses, and the intimation that some hard-working agent may be getting rich!

Among the further difficulties which Rice confronted was that keen suspicion, if not morbid fear, which Baptists have always shown toward centralization. Would not associations and conventions simply end in the complete destruction of the local independency of the churches? Is not coöperation just another name for centralization and tyranny? Besides, had Baptists not seen enough already, in the established churches, of the corruption of a hireling ministry; and would not the collection of money to support missionaries be a long step on the road to apostasy? Why forge new instruments of torture against which the fathers fought? Or why go along this new Appian way to Rome? Of course, the more enlightened did not say these things, but many did express them warmly. Even so able and ardent a home missionary as John Leland, although present in Philadelphia at the time of the formation of the General Conven-

tion (having preached the night before in the very church where it was organized), yet went on his way next day without giving it the slightest encouragement. Referring (in a letter to Spencer H. Cone) to the new movement among the churches, Leland wrote: "It has been rather trying times for Baptist preachers, who have labored day and night for the good of souls. . . . What the new order of missionary funds and exertions will do, I cannot say. Whether there is goodness enough in men to be pampered without growing indolent and haughty, is a question. One thing is certain, namely, the captive children who lived on pulse were fresher, fatter, and ten times better in counsel than the regular bred priests in the realm of Babylon, who lived on the royal portion of meat and wine."

Never did missionary live a more strenuous, self-sacrificing life than did Rice. Dr. Staughton's early impressions of Rice were wonderfully exact. He writes to Mr. Ivimy, July 11, 1814: "Mr. Rice is at present an inmate in my family. He is a man of considerable talents—a good scholar, of an easy popular pulpit address. His heart is consecrated to the work of the Lord. His spirit is catholic, but in relation to what he values as truth or duty, he is a perfect Fabricius. He knows how to bear indignity without resentment, and fatigue without complaining." (Bap. Mag., vol. vi., p. 470.)

An illustration of the thorough character of his work may be discovered from one of his annual reports: "While in Richmond, I attended the annual meeting of the Female Mission Society, the African Mission Society, the Richmond Mission Society; of preaching a sermon for a collection to aid the funds of the Juvenile Female Cent Society; of witnessing the zeal of the ladies to form an Educational Society. It afforded me much pleasure, indeed, to observe the zeal, intelligence, capacity and success discovered in the African Missionary Society. The fact, too, that little girls from six or seven to twelve or fourteen years old had formed a society to save from the purchases of little delicacies their mites to assist the glo-

rious object." (From report, April 30, 1818.) In the fiscal year 1817-1818, Rice travelled 9,359 miles, and collected \$5,443.57, and the total expenses of salary, of travel, paper, printing, postage, and distribution of the periodical, the *Latter Day Luminary*, etc., was only \$1,963.67.

A sample journey may be given: "Attended the Philadelphia Association (October, 1818) and hastened to the Dover Association, meeting in King and Queen Co., Virginia, the same week. Preached, took collection amounting to \$272 dollars; made a circuit through Maryland and Pennsylvania to the Saulisbury Asso., Delaware, consuming two weeks. The next Saturday and Sunday were spent in Fredericksburg, Va., and the following Sunday in Raleigh, N. C. Crossed the country to Lynchburg, Va., thence to Romney (now W. Va.), and reached Pittsburg; thence to Washington, Pa., Wheeling, W. Va., Zanesville, Chillicothe, West Union, Ohio; Maysville, Washington, Lexington, Georgetown, Harrodsburg, Bardstown, Louisville, Shelbyville, Frankfort, Versailles, Richmond, Campbellville, Glasgow, Kentucky; Nashville, Franklin, Murphreesboro, Lebanon, Liberty, Sparta, Knoxville, Jonesboro, and Blountville, Tenn.; Fincastle, Lynchburg, Lexington, Staunton, Harrisburg, New Market, Luray, Milford, Front Royal, Zion, Winchester, Charlestown, Harper's Ferry; thence to Fredericktown, and to Lancaster, Pa., and back to Philadelphia on Feb. 2." All this before railroads were dreamed of, when roads were bad, and much of the country was wilderness. His biographer says he would sometimes speak of *stepping over* from Virginia to South Carolina or Alabama.

When it is remembered that the Baptists, at the beginning of the nineteenth century were scattered, largely rural, and generally poor in material things; that hitherto they had scarcely glimpsed the meaning of coöperative work; that travel was to great extent over bad roads, on horse-back, through long stretches of wilderness—the achievements of Mr. Rice are not short of marvellous.

On May 6, 1817, he writes to Dr. Staughton, Corresponding Secretary of the Board: "Since the date of my letter of the 19th of June, 1816, I have travelled 6,600 miles—in populous and in dreary portions of the country—through wilderness and over rivers—across mountains and valleys—in heat and cold—by day and by night—in weariness, painfulness, fastings and loneliness, but not a moment has been lost for want of health; no painful calamity has fallen to my lot; no peril has closed upon me; nor has fear been permitted to prey upon my spirits; nor even inquietude to disturb my peace."

The reasons why Rice never returned to take up the work he laid down in the Orient, and for which his opponents criticised him severely, are quite easy to understand. When he came back to America in 1813, he devoutly wished and confidently expected to rejoin Judson before many months. He repeatedly gave the most emphatic assurances that this was his purpose. When, at the first meeting, the Convention, in 1814, appointed him their first missionary, it was requested that he "continue his itinerant services in these United States for a reasonable time, with a view to excite the public mind more generally, to engage in missionary exertions, and to assist in originating societies, or institutions for carrying the missionary design into execution." This is thoroughly in accord with Rice's statement in a letter written from Bahia, Brazil, *en route* to America, June 5, 1813: "I shall be extremely solicitous to return to India as soon as possible." But the work in the United States grew so gloriously under his hand that the Board and the Convention continued to encourage his efforts "to excite the public mind more generally."

Money came in abundantly, from societies big and little. Then came the Columbian College enterprise, which, in addition to Rice's labors as agent of the Convention, entrusted with the task of keeping the missionary streams flowing, so closely engaged his hands that it was impracticable for him to let go without disaster. There

was no time, from its founding, till Rice's death, when the college could have stood alone. When Rice ceased to be the official agent in 1826, it was too late for him or the Board to think of his going to the East, with any hope of success. The suggestion of critics that he never really expected to return to India, was a misrepresentation of the facts. Among the minor reasons for remaining in America were his failure to persuade any woman to accompany him (though it is not in evidence that he tried very hard), and also the illness (affection of the liver) which was developed while in the Orient, from which he never entirely recovered, and of which he finally died.

When all is said, the weakening of Rice's influence during his lifetime, and the partial eclipse of his star in the denominational firmament, were due partly to Rice's own disposition and his inability thoroughly to understand the methods of Baptists, into whose fellowship he had come, as well as to unfortunate circumstances over which he had no control. Rice, like many others of lofty vision, coupled with strong will and initiative, was unable to wait for others whose minds and methods were of slower gait. With him, what were well to be done, were well to be done quickly. He did not always wait for the endorsement and coöperation of his brethren. When a debated project seemed to be manifestly desirable, he went ahead to achieve it, and let the brethren *debate him!* Now, of course, this is not popular among Baptists. Such a method is not in good and regular standing. Those who looked at the method more than the thing to be done, naturally criticised, protested, and washed their hands of all. Rice was wrong; and so were his critics. Prof. Knowles was, no doubt, right in saying that Rice "was disposed to look rather at the desirableness of his plans than at the means of accomplishing them." Had all Baptists had the clear vision and the daring faith of Rice, coupled with his splendid spirit of sacrifice, the impossible of which Rice dreamed would have been accomplished and his name would be to-day the brightest legacy in American Baptist

history. But, alas, Rice did not know that the Baptist column does not move until nearly everybody is ready! This was why some of his best schemes were destined to failure.

Baptists lionized Rice when he first appeared among them. They had some able men, but Rice was unique. His earlier years with the Baptist masses was a triumphal procession. They had allowed him to have his own way, and marvellously did he sway the people. He probably came to feel that he could do anything that he regarded desirable. He confesses afterwards—to his great credit—that he had doubtless become too self-reliant and perhaps made proud by his early successes and the honors bestowed upon him. Too much was entrusted to him—more than any one man could bear. In this the dominant leaders were as much to blame as Rice. They found at last that a strong and willing horse had been ridden to his individual undoing.

It was Columbian College which became the chief source of this misfortune. Rice decided that it would be most far-seeing policy to establish an institution of learning of the first order at the seat of government, and that Baptists should do it at once. He and a group of local leaders in the city of Washington purchased a site of forty-six acres on a delightful hill adjoining the city, for \$6,000 (now worth probably as many millions). Brethren were shocked at Rice's daring, but later the Board and the Convention approved the action taken. Thus Rice plunged ahead, and collected money, added buildings, increased expenses, till the brotherhood began to take fright, and then actually to forsake the enterprise. Rice gave personal supervision to all the details of setting up the college. The theological department began September, 1821, and the academic work opened the following January with an able faculty, thirty-two earnest students, and with the hope and enthusiasm born of its founder, Luther Rice. The government officials gave the enterprise their hearty encouragement, especially President

Monroe and his cabinet, and in the early years high officials gave their money to the enterprise, and were present at the commencements. The government, too, made an appropriation, in lands, to its success. (Baptists then did not seem to be quite so sensitive to the logic of separation of Church and State). Things were going on with bright hopes till the brethren began to fail to meet Rice's early expectations of funds. Instead of being out in the field, where he had been so successful in financing the work of the Convention, his hands were tied in Washington with the organization of the college, and the erection of its buildings. Besides, he was not used to financial affairs, and knew little of keeping accounts. Bills had to be settled, and there were now no more funds to pay them. Hard times came on, and many pledges were not redeemed. To make matters worse, the agent's health broke under the strain. Poor Rice! Builders wanted their money; and the faculty could not live on the aroma of the higher learning alone. Of course, it was a fine opportunity for men to say, "I told you so," and many did say so, with deep accentuation. The college was forced to close its doors and for an entire session the faculty and students were dispersed. Rice fell into hard times as a leader, was forced to give up his position of chief agency of the Convention.

Let Mr. Rice give his own account of the immediate failure of the college enterprise—an explanation which Dr. Barnas Sears quotes approvingly (*Christian Review*, No. XXI, p. 342): "Four unfortunate errors produced, in the first instance, the embarrassment of the institution, viz: going in debt—too much cost and parade of faculty—inautiously crediting students, and supporting beneficiaries without means—and my remaining so much of my time at the college to assist in managing its affairs, instead of being constantly out collecting funds. This erroneous course was fallen into more readily, because at the time funds were circulating freely through the community and subscriptions and collections were easily ob-

tained. But when debts had been contracted, an over-proportion of faculty employed, students largely indulged on credit, with beneficiaries on hand, a great change took place in the financial condition of the whole country; still hoping this condition was only temporary, the correction was not immediately applied, as it ought to have been, and serious embarrassment, at length, began to be felt."

Nor did Rice quite understand that the people among whom he had cast his lot, the Baptists, move *when the column is ready*, and not when a commander says, "Forward, March!" He was a great success in arousing them at many centers; but to command them from a single center, failed.

But others were to blame as well as Mr. Rice for the misfortune of his educational plans. He was lionized by some and abused by others. Too much was given over into his hands. His very successes and Herculean abilities turned the heads of those in power and it is feared turned Rice's head too, for a time. He believed he could do anything to which he set his hand.

His successes were his failure in another respect also. Rice's gospel of education, preached throughout the length and breadth of Baptist territory, caused local institutions of learning to spring up—as already indicated. These called for support, which taxed the financial abilities of the people, leaving little to go toward a general institution at the nation's capital. Thus was it compelled to struggle along with the crumbs that fell from the children's table. From the time when the Triennial Convention set the college adrift, in 1826, till the Civil War, Columbian College was supported mainly by gifts and students from the South, notably from Virginia. Then came Secession—and the South was cut off from Washington. Apart from the continued friendship of a few Baptists of the District of Columbia, the denomination never again showed any practical interest in the institution which was founded by Rice, and for years was under

the denomination's direction and control. The history of Columbian College, now George Washington University, is one of the most melancholy in the annals of denominational education. Baptists had opportunity to found a strong institution at the center of national life—years before any others thought of doing so. The opportunity was again given them to come to their own, less than two decades ago. They could not, or would not; and so they lost all they had put into the enterprise during eighty years. But Rice did not live in vain, even though the two institutions, the Triennial Convention and Columbian College, into which he poured his life unstintingly, are no more in Baptist life.

The one was strangled by slavery; the other starved by poverty. But missions and education went on. They have never ceased to feel the magnificent tug given them by the propaganda of Luther Rice. Had he known his limitations as a financier, and the Baptists' ways better, his career would have been crowned with unparalleled success.

The latter part of Rice's life was spent in the South. Columbian College naturally drew its students largely from that section, and in the latter days of Rice's connection with that institution, the larger portion of the funds were also collected there. The chief source of opposition to Rice came from the North. The brethren of that section were perhaps not quite so patient with his unbusinesslike qualities. In the last decade of his life, he received no salary and was supported very largely by the free-will offerings of kind friends and the hospitality of Southern Baptist householders, who welcomed him to their homes and their hearts. Richmond, Virginia, became a sort of second home for him—especially in the home of Mr. Archibald Thomas, a prominent layman. The homes of Jesse Mercer and Dr. Cullen Battle, in Georgia, were among the chief places of rest for the weary body of the indefatigable servant of all good causes.

Those last ten years of Rice's life were not lacking in real pathos. He was no longer officially connected either with the Convention, of which he had been the chief factor in organizing, or with the college which he had founded. And yet he slackened not one whit in his zeal for education and missions. Upon his own initiative and responsibility he continued to travel and to speak and to collect moneys for the college and the Board, which had been removed to Boston. He seemed to regard it a matter of honor to do all in his power, though stripped of official relation, to meet the financial needs of the college, and set it solidly upon its feet. In 1832, Georgetown College, Ky., extended him an invitation to its presidency, but this he declined, (as he had earlier rejected a similar offer from Transylvania), that he might discharge his whole obligation to Columbian. Thus, almost in tatters, he went about sacrificing himself to the cause so near his heart. A smaller soul, when discharged from office as agent, would have become sour, perhaps even embittered, or at least have felt no further responsibility. With Rice it was not so. Indeed, it was observed by all who had known him, that those last years of his life (1826-1836) were years of special growth in grace and in sweetening and strengthening of character. Humbled, he had no doubt been. "Pride and haughtiness of spirit" which he says had once characterized him, were crucified, and his influence and example were a benediction wherever he went. The "undue levity" which some thought he at times showed—because of a certain childlikeness and buoyancy of spirit—had entirely given way to a mellowness of soul, which betokened maturity of virtues long possessed. When he returned to this country, says Jonathan Going, "all turned their eyes to Rice as a kind of oracle, and his opinions were, almost, of course, adopted." Now, however, he was without voice in the counsels of the leaders, but as zealous as ever in the work nearest his heart. Thus, as Dr. Rufus Babcock suggests, Rice was greater in failure than most men in success.

Dr. Going further lets us into the sacrificial spirit of Rice: "To meet the wants of the college, he eventually relinquished all his small savings together with two or three thousand dollars which he inherited as a patrimony; so that, in 1826, he was without a cent in the world. From that time till his death, he travelled almost constantly to preach and collect for the college, without the least support from the college or salary from any other institution. Indeed, we believe he, in a great measure, defrayed his travelling expenses from the sale of a few religious books, while the balance was borne by individual friends, who also furnished him with wearing apparel."

Rice demonstrated to the complete satisfaction of all, even his most pronounced critics and detractors, the falsity of their suspicions concerning his aims and motives. When the end of his life came, all freely admitted the marvellous devotion and complete unselfishness of a man whose mistakes were entirely of the head and not of the heart. Judson discerned aright when he wrote Rice shortly before his death, "I confidently expect that a reaction will take place, and that when temporary and local excitements shall pass away, your name will be enrolled among the *benefactors* of our country and that denomination in which we are ingrafted together."

It was upon one of his Southern trips in the interest of the college that illness overtook him at the home of Dr. R. G. Mays, in Edgefield District, S. C. There he passed away, September 25, 1836, at the age of fifty-three—not old in years, but ripened in character, "as a shock of corn cometh in his season." He was buried in the churchyard of the Pine Pleasant Church, Edgefield, South Carolina, and the South Carolina Convention erected a monument above the spot where his remains rest. Upon the horizontal slab is carved an elaborate inscription. A part of which are the words: "Perhaps no American has done more for the Missionary Enterprise. . . . No Baptist has done more for the cause of Educa-

tion. . . . His frailties with his dust are entombed; and upon the walls of Zion, his virtues engraved."

*Biographical Note.* Besides the information secured from J. B. Taylor's "Memoir of Luther Rice," and from the reports of the Triennial Convention and its Board, and numerous articles in contemporary journals—*Latter Day Luminary*, *The Columbian Star*, *Baptist Magazine*, *Christian Review*, and others—the writer wishes to acknowledge special assistance from the following kind friends: Dr. A. L. Vail, personally, and through his books, "The Morning Hour of American Missions," and "Baptists Mobilized for Missions"; Dr. J. L. Hill, of Salem, Mass.; Rev. C. S. Pease, of Adams, Mass.; Prof. H. T. Cook, author of "Biography of Richard Furman," and to Dr. Frank G. Lewis, Crozer Theological Seminary, Librarian Baptist Historical Society.

## LOVE IN ITS RELATION TO SERVICE.

A Study of Φιλέων and Ἀγαπᾶν in the New Testament.

BY SALLY NEIL ROACH, LOUISVILLE, KY.

I. Faith and hope are the soul faculties granted for the assertion of ownership vested in the soul and reaching outward to the Christ. Since that which serves must be the acknowledgement of ownership vested in the Christ and reaching inward to the soul, service must be the outcome of that faculty by which such objective ownership is expressed. This is the province of love alone. To love is to be owned; to be loved is to own. It is written: (I John 4:19) "We love him, because he first loved us." This simply means, "We confess His ownership in us, because He first granted us an ownership in Him." It is also written: (II Cor. 5:14) "For the love of Christ constraineth us." This suggests that ownership granted in Christ awakens us to His claim upon us. It is love that acknowledges with an increasing delight the personal ownership of the Lord Jesus Christ in the soul that He has redeemed. It is this love that "never faileth"; this love, alone, that serves.

II. In the very word love a volume is opened for study, and in the discussion of the sentiment the depths of human nature are sounded and its grandest heights attained. The diligent student of the English Bible, using his concordance, will soon be convinced that it is a subject about which the New Testament has much to say; and the reader of the Greek New Testament can not proceed far before his attention will be attracted by the fact that two words are used to express what at first seemed one act, the act of loving. Evidently, it must be necessary to make the acquaintance of these two words, and to understand the points of resemblance and of difference in their meanings. In such an investigation one can receive much help from a work entitled "The Johan-

nine Theology," by Dr. George B. Stevens. From Chapter XI, of this book, beginning on page 266, one reads: "Two verbs meaning *to love* are frequently used in John's writings, *ἀγαπᾶν* and *φιλεῖν*. The noun *ἀγάπη*, corresponding to *agapan*<sup>1</sup>, also occurs frequently, but *φιλία* which would correspond to *philein*, is not found. The proper difference between these two words has been frequently defined by scholars with great care. I can therefore do the reader no better service than to quote two or three of these definitions.

" 'Agapan properly denotes a love founded in admiration, veneration, esteem, like the Latin *diligere*, to be kindly disposed to one, to wish one well; but *philein* denotes an inclination prompted by sense and emotion, Latin, *amare*; ut scires, eum a me non diligi solum, verum amari. (Cicero.)' (Thayer's Lexicon, sub voce.)

" 'Philein denotes the love of natural inclination, affection,—love, so to say, originally spontaneous, involuntary; *agapan*, on the other hand, love as a direction of the will.... The range of *philein* is wider than that of *agapan*, but *agapan* stands all the higher above *philein* on account of its moral import. It does not in itself exclude affection, but it is always the moral affection of conscious, deliberate will which is contained in it, not the impulse of immediate feeling.' (Cremer, Biblico-Theological Lexicon, sub voce *agapao*.)

" 'Philein (*amare*) denotes a passionate, emotional warmth, which loves and does not dare ask why; the affection which is based on natural relationship, as of parents, brothers, etc. *Agapan* (*diligere*) denotes a calm, discriminating attachment, which loves because of the excellence of the loved object; the affection which is based on the esteem of friends. Philein is the stronger, but less reasoning; *agapan*, the more earnest, but less intense.' " (Plummer, Commentary on John 11:5.)

<sup>1</sup> For convenience, the Greek words in question will be written in English text.

It is evident, if these definitions are correct, that *agapan* is the word of loftier meaning; it is the word which expresses the ideas of choice, esteem, reverence, and the like, while *philein* designates rather those natural or friendly relations which spring from the affections. Accordingly, love to God is always denoted in the New Testament by *agapan*, and the noun for love in the religious sense is always *agape*. Men are commanded to love their enemies with the love of benevolence or the love that seeks their true good (*agapan*), not with the love of complacency or personal attachment (*philein*). It would, indeed, be incongruous to *command* love in the sense of *philein*, but not in the sense of *agapan*. From such examples of the usage it appears that *agapan* relates to the judgment or the will; *philein* rather to the emotional or sensuous nature."

Dr. Stevens, illustrating these definitions, proceeds to trace the use of *agapan* and *philein* through the writings of the Apostle John; and as their use by that apostle affords a fair sample of their use by other New Testament writers, it is convenient to adopt the same plan and classification. But, in addition to those differences set forth in the various definitions contained in the quotation submitted, one distinction between the meaning of the two words will be suggested as a crucial one, and so studied in the texts proposed. *Agapan* (and the same is true of its noun, *agape*) carries with it *invariably* the idea of the rights or the good of the object sought at the cost of the subject, while *philein* as uniformly suggests the pleasure of the subject as associated with and derived from the object. This test difference is not in the least at variance with those given. It does not alter or lessen the accepted distinctions in any degree; but it does in some places intensify meanings, and in others it furnishes a key where the meaning had else seemed obscure; and in yet others it shows clearly that the words are not used interchangeably, but makes the discrimination between them always one of nicety and of great im-

portance. Agapan is still the "loftier" word because it is always and intensely altruistic, and it is also the word that has to do with the voluntary action of the will. Philein is still the "emotional" word, relating to the spontaneous out-flow of the affections, but in it is always the idea of the Ego that is back of it and whose desires and tastes are kept prominently in the foreground.

III. Referring first to those texts in John's Gospel, in which God, the Father, is represented as loving, we find as objects "the Son, the world, and the disciples." Considering first the Father's love to the Son, agapan is used in 3:36; 10:17; 15:9; 17:23, 26. Reading in agapan in these instances the full value of the definitions given in Dr. Stevens' quotations, and remembering that these culminate in the fact that agapan denotes the good of the object sought at the cost of the subject, a fuller and richer significance is given to the love of the Father for the Son. There is shown the Father not only exercising for the Son "a calm, discriminating attachment"—agapan delighting in yielding every thing that is due—and "love as a direction of the will," but, in each case, there is expressed, suggested or implied a consequent action of the Father on behalf of the Son; that is, we see the eternal Father spending Himself in the fullness of divine power for the good—good having beginning and fruition in the fulfillment of divine purpose—and the glory of the Son in the prosecution and completion of His undertaken work of saving men. It was in this activity of altruism that the Father gave "all things" into the hands of the Son; it was this same activity of altruism that the Son exercised in behalf of and toward His chosen; it was through this activity of altruism that the world would understand the relation existing between the Father and the chosen, and between the Father and the Son; and lastly, it was this same activity of altruism that should be so manifested in the disciples. In these sentences there is a world of meaning in agapan.

Philein could never have reached the altruism that is expressed.

In one passage, 5:20, philein is used with reference to the love of the Father for the Son. Here the subject under consideration is not the Father's co-operation with the Son in the work of redemption, as in 3:36, but the Son's standing in the affections of the Father. The Master had performed a work of healing on the Sabbath, and had been assailed by the Jews. In answering them Jesus used these words, and it was as if He had said: "My Father, whom you acknowledge to be perfect, derives pleasure from association with Me, and manifests that pleasure by taking Me into His full confidence in His work." There is as much exactness and force in the use of philein in this passage as in the use of agapan in 3:36. Philein does more here than refer to the "intimate, personal relation of the Father and the Son," though it does do that. It shows the Father's approval of the Son. Those are remarkable passages in which God, the Father, is represented as loving the world, that is, unregenerate men. These passages are all quoted and discussed by Dr. Stevens, but he dismisses them with the conclusion that while "the love of God to a sinful world is not often explicitly mentioned, it is several times referred to." In all of them the verb is agapan, and the noun for love is the kindred agape. They are 3:16; I John 3:1, 16; I John 4:9, 10, 11, 19. In all but the last two the fact of the loving is assigned for the reason of the consequent act wherein Divinity spared not Itself for the good of the object of the Father's love; and in none of them is there any intimation of pleasure derived from or associated with the object loved. Philein could not be used of God's love to the world, for a perfect Ego could in no wise experience pleasure as associated with that which is sinful. On the other hand, it would be impossible to conceive a perfect God exercising a sentiment, however gracious, that was "founded in admiration, veneration, esteem" for a sinful race; neither, in

this instance, could we imagine God loving because of "the excellence of the loved object." On the contrary, in two of the passages there is the declaration and in the others the direct inference of the sinful and lost condition of the persons loved. And yet the words are agapan and the kindred agape. Hence, it follows that if these words conveyed no deeper meaning than the quotations given have assigned, these passages would be merely a jumble of contradictions. But they contain the very fullness of the gospel message—the fact that God, in His infinite purpose, sought and achieved the good of a sinful race at untold cost, and in spite of untold cost to Himself.

In speaking of the Father's love to the disciples, John uses agapan in 14:21, 23. It is in the first clause of each of these two verses, (wherein agapan is also used, and which will be quoted later,) as well as in the last clause of the 23rd verse that the full force of the altruistic action of agapan is most strikingly brought out. But here, as elsewhere, agapan characteristically *gives*. This thought in these passages is far more prominent, even granting that the disciples are now regenerate in Christ, than any thought of "admiration, veneration, esteem," or yet of the "excellence of the loved object." Still speaking of the Father's love to the disciples, John also uses agapan in 17:23. This passage is from the Master's wonderful intercessory prayer. The beautiful thought is that the Master desires that the world may understand that just as the Father did not spare Himself in seeking the good of the Son, so in His eternal purpose, He in no wise spared Himself in seeking the good of His chosen. With this verse contrast 16:27, which is the "one passage" (Dr. Stevens) in which philein is used in speaking of the love of the Father to the disciples. Here philein not only expresses the "spontaneous" affection exercised by the Father toward the disciples regarded as His children in Christ, but also the pleasurable emotion that always accompanies such spontaneous affection; and this

pleasurable emotion is represented as awakened by the contemplation of that feeling of pleasure on the part of the disciples which attends the spontaneous out-flow of regenerate affection toward the Son. It is in the exercise of this Fatherly affection that the Father is represented as hearing the prayers of His children, the disciples. There is no suggestion of altruistic activity either on the part of the Father toward the disciples or on the part of the disciples toward the Son; hence *philein*.

IV. *Philein* is not used at all by John to express the Son's love for the Father, but the Master, Himself, is represented as using *agapan* in 14:31. The world could only judge the Son's glad and willing purpose in seeking His Father's glory as the world would see that Son's full self-surrender in implicit obedience to the Father's commands. Hence, here as elsewhere, the beauty and force of *agapan* lie in the thought of the voluntary subjection of the subject for the attainment of the highest good of the object. Evidently Jesus relies upon this continued action to show His attitude to the Father.

V. As Dr. Stevens has shown, in speaking of the love of the Master to His disciples both verbs are used; but the reason for the choice according to the test suggested is always manifested in the context, proving that the two verbs are never used interchangeably. *Agapan* is used in 11:5, and there is a flash-light upon its meaning in the "therefore" of verse 6. Here the one thought emphasized is that the Master, at the cost of His own affectionate impulse, (*philein*) to which appeal has been made, (11:3,) sought the highest good of Mary and Martha and Lazarus, and "therefore" tarried in spite of the urgent message. *Agapan* is also used in 13:1, 34. Between these two statements we know occurred the institution of the Lord's Supper, and John gives the beautiful story of the washing of the disciples' feet, following it with the sad account of the sop and the going out of Judas into the night. John wrote from a point of view from which

he could look back and understand all the depth of meaning in the Supper, and his use of agapan in verse one is as if the declaration was made that the Master gave the fullest activity of altruism and shrank from nothing that would work good to His chosen; and this same Master, emphasizing the lesson of His own example by final and tender precept, by the use of agapan in verse 34 taught His disciples for His sake they ought to shrink from nothing that would work what He had esteemed good in and for one another. One more passage using agapan in referring to the Saviour's love to His disciples is 14:21. This has once been referred to in speaking of the Father's love to the disciples, and since the thought in it is so intimately connected with the thought of the love of the disciples for the Master, it will be further considered under that head.

Four passages (Dr. Stevens) are presented—13:23; 19:26; 21:7; 21:20—using agapan with reference to the Master's love for the Apostle John. The first refers to the incident at the last Passover when Peter especially wished John to find out the name of the betrayer. It is not unreasonable to suppose that in using this word here, John, considering himself as about to submit the question, would have it understood that he submitted it, relying for an answer upon that same love that did not hesitate to tarry when Lazarus was ill, and would, even now, give or withhold the name as it would be for the divine glory and the good of the disciples. In the second instance (19:26) John is about to record an appeal made by the Master to him for a specific service. What is more fitting than that he should use a word (now that he understood the full meaning of the scene at the Cross) suggestive of that Master's extreme subjection for his own (John's) highest good, thus emphasizing the obligation of the coming request? In the third instance (21:7) there has just occurred the marvelous draught of fishes, and John's quick intuition has discovered the Lord where other eyes were dim. It was this Lord who had always

proven Himself considerate for their welfare, and who had now given a new and characteristic instance of the altruism of His love; this Lord who, John was beginning to understand, had given Himself, even on the Cross, for John's own special good; this Lord who was more and more coming to be known to this one disciple as the exponent of agapan exercised toward himself. What wonder then, considering himself as the object, that John should, at this special time, choose a word in speaking of the Master's love that would refer to the proofs of that love rather than to the Master's pleasure in loving? In the last instance (21:20) Peter, having been restored, and having been reassigned to his work with the accompanying assurance of the fate that awaited him, (an assurance graciously granted that henceforth the higher development of his love might be evident), with characteristic impulsiveness wonders what shall be the fate of his friend who is already schooled in this wonderful altruistic love which Peter is just beginning to learn. The forgiven apostle had no word of complaint for his own prospective fate. That he was restored at all was to him a marvel of grace beyond his power to tell. But John had proved true to his Master in the very tests by which Peter fell, and Peter thought of him as the disciple for whose welfare the divine love (agapan) would, even in temporal things be most especially active. Would not he be screened from prison and from death by the Lord who loved him? The Master's rebuke is prompt and effective. At the very beginning of his renewed task Peter must learn that the love that serves, the love that seeks the Master's glory in all things, must trust all things (not only one's own temporal interests, but—what is harder—the temporal interests of those who are near and dear) to the Master utterly. Here is emphasized the thought that one of the elements distinguishing the love that serves (agapan) from the soul's spontaneous affection (philein) is an absolute and abiding trust in God's eternal loving (agapan).

There is one passage, 20:2 (to which Dr. Stevens refers, and concerning which he cautions that although it may not prove that the two verbs bear "precisely the same shade of meaning," yet, "the proper distinction of the words must not be overpressed"), in which philein is used with reference to the Master's love for John. It certainly is a remarkable fact, and one which, at the outset, must attract attention, that this is the only place in which this grand old apostle uses the word philein in speaking of the Master's love for himself. The passage cited is in the beginning of the story of the resurrection, and before its marvelous wonders and effects had fully dawned upon the minds of the disciples. Even from his old age John goes back to the pathos of the story, and, catching the thrill of excitement attendant upon the first strange tidings of the empty tomb, he dwells upon the Master's never-to-be-forgotten affection for His servant and friend, and not upon the Master's Self-surrender for that servant's good. The latter is not denied; it is simply not affirmed. In the recollection of the preceding depression and of the amazement of the moment, the broader, spontaneous idea takes precedence of that which is deeper and altruistic. It is these occasional uses of philein in John's writings that serve to bring out by contrast the stronger emphasis of agapan.

Of kindred nature to the above is the use of philein in 11:3, 36 in expressing the love of the Master for the members of the household at Bethany. In their message to the Master the sisters seem to have thrown the whole of their urgent and impulsive plea upon the Master's personal affection for their brother. They longed for His presence and for the help which that presence would surely bring, and philein would certainly prompt His coming. The use of philein by the sisters in verse three serves to throw out in bold relief John's use of agapan in verse 5, when he assigns the reason for the Master's delay. Philein pleads that for the gratification of the Master's fondness for His friend He shall at once hasten

to Bethany; agapan looks deeper and demands that, not only for the good of him for whom the prayer was made but also for the effective training of those praying, the Master shall restrain His own desires and abide where He is. Is it not true to-day that we often plead for person or thing, appealing in all of the eagerness of philein, and are kept waiting for the richer and more comprehensive blessing of the divine agapan? This marked contrast is one of the expressive shadings by which these words make far more vivid this wonderful story. Certainly, here, they are not interchangeable. Verse 36 continues the narrative as the sorrowing group, followed by sympathizing friends of Mary and Martha, stands about the sepulchre. There "Jesus wept," and those who observed saw not only sympathy with the sisters, but also the natural distress of a love that had been deprived of its object. Hence, the word employed is naturally the emotional term suggestive of the personal, friendly affection that Jesus had for Lazarus which was now manifested in this expression of grief at His loss. As yet, to the surface-seeing Jews, or to the sorrowing sisters there was nothing in the action of Jesus to call forth the deeper word. How could they predicate "agape" as John did in verse 5?

VI. Not the least interesting part of this study is that of those passages relating to the love of the disciples for the Master and for their brethren. The account (21:15-19) of the restoration of Peter will be considered separately. Another passage—quoted by Dr. Stevens—using agapan is 8:42. These words were spoken not to the disciples, but to the Jews. To them are presented God's claims for honor due and for the love that would seek His glory, even at the cost of the subject. Jesus having been sent by God and being God's Son, this form of love was due to Him, and would have been accorded, if God's claims had been recognized. It is the claim of Divinity that is here considered, not at all the pleasure of humanity; hence agapan. The passages concerning

the disciples are 14:15, 21, 23, 24, 28, all from that Holy of Holies to the Christian's heart. Here the love exercised by the Christian, as well as that exercised by the Father and the Son to the Christian, is constantly expressed by agapan. In every single instance that which is due to the object and seeks the highest glory of Divinity—obedience, reverence, and rejoicing over prospective glory—is the prominent thought connected with the loving. Never once is there any intimation to the disciples of the expression of their own enjoyment. It is in passages like these—agapan yielding all that is due because of its essential desire for the good of the object—where its action seems to be founded in "admiration, veneration, esteem," or to be based upon "the excellence of the loved object." But here, as in the case of God's love to man, where its action can not be so founded, the action of agapan (unlike that of philein) begins in the will, which resolutely fixes attention upon the right or the good of the object and its consequent claim upon the subject. Verse 21 has already been referred to in the discussion of the love of the Father and of the Son to the disciples. Here, markedly, agapan *gives* rather than *gets*. The disciple gives obedience, while God's giving is a gracious manifestation and indwelling of Divinity. What is characteristically true of the Father and of the Son is also true of the Holy Spirit. From the remoteness of eternity God has loved His people (Jer. 31:3—Septua.; 38:3) with an unswerving, beneficent love, and so, has spared Himself in nothing for their salvation and their preservation and their training. It is fitting, therefore, that He should demand as the beginning and the continuation of their service to Him a like self-abandoning, altruistic (*agape*) love.

With the last quoted passages compare Matt. 10:37 and John 12:25 in which the word representing the action of loving is a form of philein. In each of these the emphatic thought is not at all the desired good of the object, but the preference exercised by the subject, and

the degree of pleasure perceived in connection with contrasted objects. They serve by contrast to bring out sharply the distinction between the words in question in discussing a disciple's love for his Lord.

With reference to the love of the disciples for one another 13:34 has been quoted. Aside from the use of agapan in referring to His own love for the disciples, the Master's example clearly defined the altruistic nature of agapan in the commandment given. In addition, we have 15:12, 17, and I John 3:23; 11:7, 11. It is worthy of remembrance that the action of philein is always spontaneous and is never commanded. In his First Epistle, where John has much to say on this subject, and where he devotes one section to the discussion of "The Commandment—Love," agapan and its kindred noun, agape, are the words that he constantly uses. The most careless reader must perceive that in emphasizing "The Commandment" stress is constantly laid upon the example, the unswerving, altruistic love graciously accorded by Divinity to helpless humanity.

In passing, it is worth while to note one passage—15:19—in which the world (unregenerate humanity) is represented as loving, and in which John quotes the Master as using philein. To one who is at all observant it must be manifest that "the world" can not and does not give an altruistic love, but loves only as pleasure or profit is consciously derived from the object and in the act. Hence, the use of philein.

VII. The conversation between the Lord Jesus and Peter after the resurrection furnishes a notable instance of the use of the two words and is commented upon by Dr. Stevens. Although he admits that "the view generally adopted" claims here a distinction between the two words, yet he thinks "with Weiss," that it is doubtful whether that distinction "is applicable here." Considering the constant use of philein by Peter, the use of agapan by the Lord in the first two questions, and the statement that "Peter was grieved because he said to

him the third time; "Phileis me;" even admitting the possibility of the two words being interchangeable elsewhere, it would be very difficult to believe them interchangeable here. It is submitted that if, in addition to "the view generally adopted," the distinction suggested as crucial i. e., the distinction emphasizing the altruism of *agapan* and the egoism of *philein*—be here observed, the Lord's questions have an intensified force and the meaning is still more clearly brought out by a slight emphasis on "me" in the third question. It is as if the Lord had said: "Peter, do you love (*agapan*) me so that you can surrender your life to my interests?" The memory of the crucifixion is fresh, the bitter tears of repentance have yet scarcely dried, and Peter has just drawn the marvelously filled net upon the shore. With the same impulse that bade him a few moments ago to cast himself into the sea that he might out-strip the lingering boat, he longs to come closer, closer, closer to the Lord. Throwing himself on the Master's knowledge, he responds: "Yes, Lord, thou knowest that my heart goes out (*philein*) to thee and my pleasure is found in thee." Then follows a command which, it would seem easy to be obeyed. The question is repeated in the same way, and Peter gives the same answer, and receives the second command in which more is involved. Then, pressing him more closely, and with His searching eyes upon him, the Lord says: "Peter, *does* your heart go out to *me*, (*philein*), and *is* your pleasure found in *me?*" This touches the disciple to the quick. Painfully he is reminded that the testimony of his own conduct must have declared that his affections could not be centered in his Lord, and then,—he could have neither part nor lot with the Master nor in the Master's work! Who can say that there did not flash through his mind the words: "Blessed art thou, Simon, son of Jonas, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven?" Standing there before his Master, face to face with his discovered self, and striving only

to hold the ground upon which at first he stood, he throws his case absolutely upon the Master's verdict, and answers: "Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that my heart goes out to thee (*philein*) and my pleasure is found in thee." And then comes the third emphatic command followed by the Master's "Verily, verily," and the awakened apostle learns, as he hears the certainty of his fate from his Lord's own lips, that in the life of the servant of Christ the Master's interest and not the servant's safety is what must be considered, that *agapan* must prove the truth of *philein*, and that *agapan* alone can serve. But in that one packed moment Peter learned more. He saw that however others might turn aside with scorn, the Master knew and believed in the *philein* that by the new birth existed in the heart of His servant and yet could in no wise prove its own reliability. And he saw that that which, in the outburst of *philein*, his untutored heart was permitted to offer (prison and death for the Saviour) must be delivered in full as the offer was permitted to be made; for, having been permitted to touch the "altar" of service, the full impulses of that untrained love became consecrated by the altar and must be interpreted and made good by *agapan*, or, to the shame of Him permitting, the supremacy of the "altar" over the "gift" placed upon it would be subject to question. The Lord's "may" of opportunity became to Peter an imperative "must" destined to glorify his life after the Master had been glorified in his life. Restored to his task, the disciplined disciple began to see how, by infinite, eternal loving, (*agapan*,) there was being "ministered" unto him "abundantly" an "entrance into the kingdom of Jesus Christ."

VIII. There is one passage in John's First Epistle, 4:18, in which, using the noun *agape*, with striking emphasis and force he brings out the nature of the altruistic love that is the beginning and continuation of service. This service love, (*agape*), or act of loving, (*agapan*) is under the control of a subjected will; a will that keeps at-

tention upon the expressed will of the Deity that is loved, and lies in harmony therewith. Therefore fear is lost in trust, and torment in the soul gives way to peace. Because it knows no fear that other statement made by the Apostle Paul concerning this wonderful, God-taught, Christ-centered, service love is true. Compare I Cor. 8:8, "The love never faileth." "The love" obeys. At all costs to self the soul that is taught in this love does just what the Lord makes known that He wants it to do. Is there a greater boon to be desired or received by the redeemed than this one essential to service, awakened in the soul by the power of the constraining love (II Cor. 5:14) of the Christ centered in Him, and kept alive by constant renewals of divine grace?

Studying in contrast the more emotional word, philein, in addition to those passages containing it that have been taken from the writings of John a few passages from other sources will help to render more clear its meaning and to emphasize its egoistical nature. Take for instance, Matt. 6:5; 23:6; Lu. 20:46; Tit. 3:15. In all these passages philein is the verb used and translated by the English "love," and in all of them, even in the last, where those loving are evidently regenerate, it is clear that the thought considered is not merely the "involuntary" or "spontaneous" affection of the subject, but also the gratification or pleasure of the subject as connected with and derived from the object. It is submitted that this egoistic tendency of philein is its most important characteristic. When this phase of loving is exercised by the Deity the egoism manifested is the egoism of Perfection, and the assertion of its pleasure becomes to the object a mark of gracious approval. Whenever philein is predicated of the unregenerate, as of the Scribes and Pharisees, its egoism becomes the bold assertion of selfish desires and selfish enjoyment. When it is predicated of those unregenerate, (John 16:27; 21:15-17; Tit. 3:5,) there is simply considered the spontaneous affection of the new-born soul for the divine, or

for the manifestation of divine truth in Christianity or the divine image in Christians, and the gratification experienced from a permitted association therewith. When the subject is man, in hearts newly regenerate or fresh in experiences of grace this (*philein*) loving reaches its noblest attainment, because it is exercised toward its highest possible object, (and here it is as winsome as the spontaneous love of a little child,) and because it also reveals the elevation of the regenerate nature in its inherent and spontaneous out-reach for divinity; “because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.” But the very spontaneity of this (*philein*) love (and it is being considered now as exercised by the regenerate heart) is one phase of its weakness as its subjective gratification in imperfect human nature is another; for it is not exercised beyond the bounds of the latter, and, being spontaneous, it is exercised only as its object attracts the involuntary attention of the subject; hence, it is liable to wane or to be diverted as the involuntary attention of the subject is interrupted or attracted elsewhere. Herein, where man is concerned, lies the essential limitation of *philein* which renders it unfit for service. In human nature, albeit regenerate, it is as incapable of continuous action as the untrained mind of a little child is incapable of continuous thought. *Philein* means to love, that is, it means an approving recognition and avowal of the loved object’s ownership in the subject loving. It is not its function to suffer nor to give any gift that costs in sacrifice.

IX. In closing this study there are two groups of passages that challenge investigation, because, at first sight, they seem to contradict the test proposed as crucial by a suggestion that the words are synonymous in meaning. The first group is this: Prov. 3:12 in Sept. (using *agapan*); Heb. 12:6 (also using *agapan*, evidently a quotation of the last, differing in only one word); Rev. 3:19 (manifestly quoted from same source, though less

direct, uses *philein*.) Considering what has been demonstrated, at first glance this seems remarkable, and especially so when one remembers that in the writings of John, *agapan* is the favorite word. Why then was not *agapan* used as in Proverbs and Hebrews? Does *philein* here have the force of *agapan*? And if so here, why not elsewhere? From a careful reading of the verse in Proverbs in connection with the one preceding, the altruistic force of *agapan* is clearly shown. The Lord certainly is not loving because of any "excellence in the object," neither is He exercising "admiration, veneration, esteem." The "son" is wayward, perverse, unruly, and the Father loves him for his good, and therefore, "corrects" and "scourges." There is not the remotest suggestion of pleasure experienced by the Father in the act; therefore, *philein* is not used, and the meaning of *agapan* is established. The context of the passage in Hebrews is similar, and the force of *agapan* still lies in its altruism. Indeed, the whole bearing of the passage is that the beloved one is exhorted to recognize the altruism exercised in his behalf and to esteem it a blessing although its manifestation is productive of immediate pain. But with the verse in Revelation the context changes. From the 14th verse the Master is sending a message to "the angel of the church of the Laodiceans," and for the moment the thought even of the ultimate good that may come to the object from the message is overshadowed and lost in the expression of the great displeasure of the subject. Bearing this in mind, and connecting verse 19 with the kindred verses in Proverbs and Hebrews, there is given a strong "*a fortiori*" argument. Thus, "As many as I delight in" (*philein*, contrasted with verses 14-16) "I seek their good" (*agapan*, Prov., Heb.) "and rebuke and chasten: how much sterner then shall my chastening be with thee, when I would spew thee out of my mouth! Be zealous, therefore, and repent." Truly, there is as much meaning in the use of *philein* here as in that of *agapan* in the other

two passages! Agapan would not have conveyed the full measure of the rebuke.

The next group of challenging passages is this: John 3:19; I John 2:15; Heb. 1:9 (this last, quoted directly from Sep., Ps. 44:8; Eng., Ps. 45:8). In all of these the word translated love is agapan. Citing all three passages, Westcott and Hort, in their New Testament Lexicon (under ἀγαπάω) translate "to take pleasure in." Does agapan then in these cases lose its altruistic import and take on the egoism of philein? If that is so here, why not elsewhere?

The first passage is taken from the narrative of the Master's interview with Nicodemus, and closely follows the verse where agapan is used in declaring the divine altruism that gave a Saviour to a sinful world. This Saviour came as the light of the world, and it was His right that He should hold mastery over the world and be accorded reverence and obedience. Therefore it is the claim of the object that is emphasized, and not the pleasure of the subject. The condemnation is that men withheld from Him this mastery, refusing obedience to the light that He gave. It is not that men simply and impulsively preferred the darkness, but that they yielded themselves to promote the darkness, thereby proclaiming their own inherent sinfulness. There is a choice, but it is a choice of masters. The condemnation in agapan is deeper than philein could here have expressed. The second passage is of a kindred nature, and is taken from John's discussion of "Light" manifest as the "Message" (I John 1:5) from divinity, and marks his third test of the possession of that light which is ability to choose after seeing things as they really are. Because in the thought of choice the preference of the subject is certainly involved, the test proposed as crucial would seem to require here the use of the verb philein. But while John is discussing choice, he is going more deeply into the question than the mere preference of the subject. Again, his earnest purpose reaches on to the mas-

tery of the object chosen, and therein lies the reason for his use of agapan. The word "world" here can not mean the people in the world, for the Father Himself loved (agapan, John 3:16) them with the same agapan that John here forbids. Neither can "things in the world" mean mere worldly possessions, for John goes on to explain that he is talking of "the lust of the flesh," "the lust of the eyes" and "the pride of life," and these are "not of the Father." Therefore, the beloved apostle is talking here of the world-principle—that which entices and wins and then subjugates and controls. To this world-principle, when it has been clearly seen in the light of the New Life, the Christian must not, and, of his own free choice, will not yield the slightest right or mastery in himself. Therefore, John used agapan, remembering that his Master had said: "No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one, and love (agapan) the other; or else, he will hold to the one, and despise the other." (Matt. 6:24.)

From these two passages it is evident that agapan, losing nothing of its force and power, may be centered upon that which is opposed to God, and therefore, may be engaged in service which is not service to the Christ. In other words, there is an altruism—of which the Christian, as well as the world, is in danger—in which Self in some remote disguise is the ultimate object for whose interest the whole man is held in most stern subjection, the result in character being all of the intense and persistent application of agapan with the coldness and hardness and sinfulness of the dominant self. Witness Saul of Tarsus as he persecuted the Christians, and the elder brother in the Master's parable of "The Two Sons." This is agapan wrongly mastered—characteristically serving, strengthening and keeping on the alert every human faculty through the continuous acts of service, and yet, spiritually degraded and degrading through the fact and ultimate allegiance of that which is served.

The third passage under consideration differs from the other two in that the object loved is "righteousness" and the subject loving is the eternal Son, but it is like the other two in that the emphasis is again placed upon the mastery of the object, in each case the attention of the subject being voluntary and persistent and controlling. Here the Son is represented not simply in taking a spontaneous pleasure in righteousness—although that is not denied—but as yielding Himself to the complete mastery of righteousness over Himself that constrained Him, "even unto death," to withhold Himself from all subjection to iniquity. A choice is involved; but it is a choice looking not so much to subjective gratification as to objective mastery. Hence, agapan, and hence, the asserted reward. It is this choice of righteousness that is not merely the spontaneous outburst, but the inherent purpose,—and not only the inherent purpose, but the positive obligation and the crowning glory of the Christian.

X. Having thus learned the difference between philein and agapan, it is not difficult, as one turns the sacred pages, to recognize the one or the other in this one or that one of the servants of God, as his life story is there recorded. There are dark sides to the picture, but there are bright ones also, and one cannot fail to observe that often-times he who failed because of the weakness of philein afterwards became a hero under the control of a Heaven-taught agapan.

Conclusions are inevitable. Since it is love alone that serves, one can not fail to see that there can be no deeper and more searching test of Christian character and efficiency than the word that must be used to express the Christian's love for his Lord as he is confronted by the demands of service. Again, it is a matter of great comfort and encouragement to note that those who sometimes faltered and failed through the childishness and impulsiveness of philein, or some mysterious change,

developed in later years into marvelous exponents of agapan. It is also a comfort to see that the power and force of a wrongly centered agapan have been diverted from their harmful tendencies and turned into channels for good by an abrupt and radical change of attention and a recognition of a new mastery on the part of an arrested soul. It will be remembered that the Apostle Paul, who said of agape;—"The love never faileth," said also: "Now abideth faith, hope, love," (agape) "these three; but the greatest of these is love." (I Cor. 12:13.) The Master said to His apostles: "And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." (Matt. 20:17.) Therefore the pre-eminence of love over faith and hope must lie in the fact that love (agape), and love only, serves. Again, in His wonderful intercessory prayer—that prayer that must stir to the depths the heart of every Christian—the Master prays for His disciples: (John 18:21:) "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us;" and in verse 26 He continues: "That the love" (agape) "wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them." This love that serves (agape) is then the basis of fellowship with the Master, and through Him with the Father and also with the redeemed, thus making the disciples one with each other and with their Lord—one in the great heart-throbs of an altruism that, at all costs to self, reaches out to whomsoever it may reach for the Master's sake and in the Master's name.

From these conclusions earnest questions arise. Is it not a matter of untold importance that the redeemed soul shall be taught to "put away childish things" in the passing from the impulsiveness of the spontaneous and egoistic philein to the steadiness of the will-directed and altruistic agapan? And is it not a matter of equal importance that the will of the redeemed soul, which is to keep firm rein upon the action of agapan, shall itself be brought into a glad and worshipful accord with the

will of Him whose altruism was manifested in the highest and deepest action of agapan that the universe can ever know? And finally, does not the Holy Spirit, who seeks the development of the worker as well as the progress of the work, in His mysterious calls to service prove His supreme authority over service by laying bare with unsparing hand the deepest and most secret tendencies of the soul in this all-important matter of loving, in order that He may most effectually minister to the inmost needs of the redeemed, as well as secure the eternal efficiency of the called?

## MODERNISM.

## II.

By PROFESSOR GIOVANNI LUZZI, FLORENCE, ITALY.

Modernism is not a new phenomenon; it is the most recent phase of the antagonism between two tendencies, one ultra-conservative, and the other progressive, which, in a more or less acute form, is found in every period of the history of the Church. It is an antagonism which, if it has produced evils, has also brought with it many important benefits. We know that everything that does not progress is destined to die; and the progressive tendency has prevented the conservative from stagnating and perishing, in the same way that the conservative tendency has acted as a brake to the progressive, and prevented it from going too far and too fast.

Hermas and Hippolytus first; then Jovinian and Vigilantius, Claudio bishop of Turin, and Ratherius of Verona; Arnold of Brescia, the Waldenses, St. Francis and the Franciscan movement, and St. Dominic; Dante, Savonarola, Michelangelo; all the martyrs of the Protestant Revolution in Italy, and the heroes of the first dawn of the Italian evangelical mission, were all modernists. They were strong opposers above all of the tendency of the Church to forget her calling, and to become altogether worldly. And when the Church became worldly, it was they who said to her, in the spirit of John the Baptist: "It is not lawful for thee to live as thou dost," and who exhorted her to convert herself and to return to her first love and to her primitive simplicity. They were modernists who wanted exactly what the modernists of our time want: To urge the Church of their fathers, with all their might, to repent and to believe, and to remind her of the greatness of her calling in the midst of the Latin race.

Between the far away modernists I have mentioned and our present modernists, stand a group of thinkers, about the first half of the XIXth century, who were the continuators of the former and the forerunners of the latter.

Let us at least record some of their names. In the first place is Giuseppe Mazzini who, from the land of his exile, wrote: "Roman Catholicism is nothing but the religion of one man or of more men. The Church has been deeply corrupted and needs to be reformed and led back to the simplicity and purity of apostolic times. In Italy, the right of reforming her is not the privilege of a few, but is the right of the whole Church, from the lowest to the highest of her members; because I do not understand the Church to be the monopoly of a few, but the general assembly of all believers." He advocated the idea of calling an Italian Council, which he hoped would be able "to save the Church from superstition and infidelity." Then Antonio Rosmini, the immaculate philosopher, who wept for 'the five wounds of the Church'; Vincenzo Gioberti, who unmasked modern Jesuitism, and in his work "Catholic Reformation" inspired by Savonarola's words: "Ecclesia indiget reformatio," said: "Hitherto people wanted to reform Rome without the help of Rome; nay, in spite of Rome; now they must reform Rome through Rome herself." Father Passaglia, a Neapolitan Jesuit, who openly fought the temporal power of the Popes, and insisted on the urgent need of reforming ecclesiastical education, and of going back to the primitive discipline of the Church; Monsignor Tiboni, who wanted the Bible spread far and wide among the people, and strongly opposed the exaggerated pretensions of modern Papacy; Monsignor Liverani, held in great estimation by the Curia, who wrote a remarkable treatise, which made a great sensation, on *Papacy, the Empire and the Kingdom of Italy*; and also Reali, Perfetti, Salvoni, Moretti and Raffaello Lambruschini.

Raffaello Lambrùschini was a priest highly esteemed by all, and a great teacher. He put two questions to himself and the public: "The fundamental principles of the doctrines of the Roman Catholic clergy, the precepts directing ecclesiastical discipline, and the spirit animating the teaching and the conduct of the clergy, are they really the principles, the precepts, the spirit of the Gospel?" He was bound to answer: "No." The other was: "Are the accessory parts of religion, the parts which religion can and must adapt to the spirit of the times, in harmony with the spirit of our age?" Here too, he was bound to answer: "No." And after having described the miserable condition of the Church of those days, he said: "No, we cannot go on in this way. We must break our chains, throw off the yoke of a bondage harder than the Jewish one. We must go back to the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. We must get hold of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians and rebuild our religious life. If not, the world will lose itself; a spirit of rebellion will arise, nay, it has already arisen. The Church is no longer loved as a mother; she is detested as a cruel step-mother; and we may be sure that being what she is on account of her errors, ignorance, and passions, she will fall, as the Synagogue fell. The husk will fall off. The true Church of Jesus Christ will revive, will grow young and beautiful again, as His new Bride." Lambruschini knew too well that such a rejuvenescence of the Church could only take place by means of a radical reformation in the Church herself. "The Reformation of the Church is so necessary," he wrote, "that it surely will be brought about; and it may be brought about in four ways: (1st) By the Pope, or, at least, with the Pope; (2nd) by the bishops, without the Pope; (3rd) by the minor clergy without the Pope and without the bishops; (4th) by the laity without the clergy. The first way (by the Pope or with the Pope) would be the easiest, the quietest, the most acceptable; but where is a Napoleonic Pope to be found? The second (by the bishops without the Pope) is, I think, impossible.

The third (by the minor clergy without the Pope and bishops) I do not think very probable. The fourth (by the laity without the clergy) I think to be even less probable than the third. But God's thoughts are not man's thoughts. If reasonable protestants could see their way to uniting themselves with reasonable Roman Catholics with a view to bringing about this reformation, the reformation would be greatly facilitated. Nothing could resist this combination."

About 1862, a paper called *The Catholic Emancipator*, founded by a Dominican friar, Luigi Prota-Guirleo of St. Domenico Maggiore in Naples, appeared. It served as an official organ to an Association of priests who wanted emancipation from the Roman bondage. The Association became wide-spread. It had as members about 3500 priests and friars, and double the number of laymen, including 32 Members of Parliament, 16 Senators, 4 Government Ministers, 86 Magistrates, 3 Generals, 50 officers, and had, as affiliated, 32 other secondary Associations scattered about in the various provinces of Italy. The movement was therefore most important, and who knows what national proportions it might have attained, had it not been spoiled by internal misunderstandings, and by the desertion of not a few who could not resist the persecutions of the Curia.

The Jesuit Father Curel, an old friend of Pius IX and founder of the Jesuit Review the *Civiltà Cattolica*, leads us to the year 1871. Up to this date Curel had always been a staunch defender of the Vatican Curia; but a few months after the breach of Porta Pia, he veered round, and first in a pamphlet on the event of the great "20th of September," and then on several other occasions, especially in a famous letter to the Pope published in the European Review, expressed the theory of resignation in the face of events in which it is our duty to acknowledge the hand of God. The work of this man, whom the Italians have too soon forgotten, was not confined to that alone. His book, *The Vatican Court*, was a protesting

cry against the Pope's thirst after earthly power and the worldliness of the Church; his *New Testament translated and explained, with exegetical and ethical notes*, also told Italy how great was the love of this pious man for the Word of God, and how deeply convinced he was that a true and lasting spiritual regeneration of Italy could only be expected from the Gospel.

If we were to try and concentrate into one cry all those voices which protested against Papal Rome at that time, a time not very far removed from ours, here is what we should hear the single voice demand: The abolition of compulsory celibacy of the clergy; the education of the clergy to be carried out not in the narrow limits of seminaries, but with a more ample horizon, and perfected in the great national educational institutions, and this, with the view of bringing together in harmony the priesthood and laity, the Church and Society; the Holy Scriptures to be spread all over the country, and to become, as Chrysostom wanted them to be, the guide of all believers; the abolition of the ordinance directing the same liturgy in a language not understood by the people to be used in all churches, and a return to the practice of the early Church when every nation prayed to God in its own language, and all the churches were intimately united by the bonds of faith and love; the sacrament of the Holy Communion to be administered in its Biblical integrity, with the bread and the cup to the people; the restitution to the clergy and the people to their ancient rights concerning the election of their pastors; and the restoration to the bishops of their ancient diocesan rights by which they occupied not a position of bondage such as at present, but a free and independent position.

All the men I have mentioned, with a crowd of others, in their day, dreamt of a reform within the Church so dear to their heart; but the times were not ripe; the idea, though it remained only an idea, did not die, because nothing dies that is truly good; it passes from generation to generation, and shows itself on the horizon to those who

are capable of understanding it, until, in the fulness of time, it becomes a reality. Modernism is therefore not a new thing; it is the ideal of sporadic prophets of old, which, in modern times, is being accepted by many, and seems to be preparing for the day when it will be accepted by all.

Let us now ask: "What is the attitude of the Vatican in face of this revolutionary movement?"

To this attitude I have already referred in my previous article; but allow me to give you a clear idea of this attitude by drawing your attention, in this connection to two very eloquent facts. The *Motu proprio* issued by Pius X on the 8th of September, 1910, and the doom of the *Pious Society of St. Jerome*.

The *motu proprio* crashed like a thunderbolt. The Pope had evidently meant to use it so as to give a last blow to Modernism. Among other things, it contained an injunction requiring a large part of the clergy to take an oath of orthodoxy and of loyalty to the true doctrine and Roman Catholic discipline. The oath was to be taken by all professors at the beginning of their yearly courses; by clerics of an inferior order before their promotion to a higher order; by all new confessors, by all parish priests, canons, beneficed clergymen before coming into possession of their benefices, and by all officials in ecclesiastical courts. The formula of the oath required a declaration accepting and professing all the articles of belief defined by the infallible Church, and included the complete approval of everything said in the Encyclical *Pascendi* (8th September, 1907), in the decree *Lamentabili*, called the *Syllabus* of Pius X (3rd July, 1907), and also the complete rejection of all new modernist theories, which were specified with great care and condemned with great force in the latter part of the document.

The *motu proprio*, intended to be a last blow to modernism, resulted instead in another blow to the Vatican. In fact, you remember the bold declarations of the Roman Catholic professors at Münster, the strong letter of the

French modernist priests to the archbishops and bishops of France, the way in which the Russian censure called the Vatican to order, and how everywhere the Pope had to come to a kind of compromise with the enemy. In Italy, for instance, there are many priests, who are at the same time professors in different schools. Very many of these professors were not ordered to take the oath. Why? Because the Curia saw that the larger number of them would have rebelled against the imposition, and left the Church. They are all men of independent means, with University degrees, having the doors of all Government Schools open to them, and the loss of the meagre income derived from saying mass would be to them an insignificant loss. Would you care to know what the spirit is that animates these noble souls, these cultured men, who have given the Church the best years of their lives, but who are not ready to sacrifice to her their liberty, their dignity, their conscience? Listen to these few lines one of them wrote me, on the morrow of the issuing of the *Mortu proprio*: "My dear friend, before closing my letter, let me unboson myself and tell you one thing more: What happens in my Church is more than I am able to bear. I feel that I have had quite enough of this Catholic Church of ours. Every day she becomes more and more a bare-faced negation of Christ and of His Word. I feel that to continue to wear the garb I am now wearing, and to remain in the society I belong to, is not only a lie, but a sort of denial of all that is most noble and holy in the Gospel. And since we have to give an account of ourselves to God, I believe it to be my right and my duty to throw off this garb and to escape from this Roman prison. As soon as the oath is required of me, my friends whom you know, and I, will leave the Church. You know what I mean; when I say *we shall leave the Church*, I am only using the current phrase; the real fact is that we are forced to leave the Church of the Vatican in order to remain in, and to be faithful to the Church of Christ."

Others, when ordered to take the oath, refused energetically, and left the Church. Others grouped themselves together, and, following the example of their fellow-priests of France, before taking the oath, wrote and published in the newspapers an anonymous letter to their bishops and archbishops in which, after having expressed their motives for their taking such a momentous step as writing this letter, concluded by saying: ‘Before submitting to this act of violence, we protest in the sight of God, of the Church and of your Lordship, that such an oath does not in any way pledge our conscience, nor does in any way modify our ideas. After taking the oath, we shall remain what we were before.’ The larger number of those obliged to take the oath, took it against their conscience; and, evidently, all those who took the oath in that spirit, showed clear signs of their false, crooked education, of their poor courage, of their small faith. They ought to have stood up as one man, they ought to have been led by their bishops against those who had ordered them, that with their hands on the Gospel, they should deliberately dishonor the Gospel. But if such behavior has no justification, has it at least some extenuation? Let us hear the answer of an ex-priest who, a short time before the injunction to take the oath, left the Church with nothing else in this world except seven dollars, which a poor woman had given him in payment for twenty masses, and which the good soul made him a present of, when he offered to return them to her. “With nothing else than those few francs, did I leave the Church and face the uncertainty of my future. But how many priests and friars are there from whom such an act of courage might be expected? To speak of martyrdom when there is no peril impending, and to speak of hunger when sitting at a well spread table, is easy; but when the wolf is already at the door of the poor parish priest who has nothing else on earth but the scanty income from a daily meagre mass to count upon, who has perhaps besides himself an old father and an old mother to support, who knows that if he leaves

the Church all ways will be barred against him and not a soul will he find to give him a job, the question becomes appalling indeed; and if the Vatican takes him by the throat, and under those circumstances forces him to take an oath which is against his conscience, the priest will probably commit an immoral act, but the Vatican will have killed a man." No, the ex-priest is wrong; the Vatican will not have killed a man; it will have made and secured for itself an enemy who, on the great day of reckoning, will fight with the fury of one who has been wounded in what he holds most dear and sacred.

And let us not forget a most important thing. Those who have taken the oath are not the whole army; behind them is a large reserve, which has not yet appeared on the field; there are thousands, ten thousands of priests, who have not been called to take the oath; there is the whole of the laity, which up to the present has been slumbering, but is now awakening fast, and which fully sympathizes with the movement against the tyrannical power of the Vatican. What will happen to-morrow? Who knows if to-morrow we shall not witness what can not happen to-day—a resistance of the mass?

After the Pope's *Motu proprio*, the doom of the Pious Society of St. Jerome. I have made a passing allusion to this Society in my previous article. A group of Modernists, ten years ago, conceived a grand idea. Like wise architects, they thought of beginning the edifice of the reformation of the Church from the base and not from the roof; they concerned themselves, that is, not with the reform of dogma, but with the reform of the inner life of the people. As in the Church it is not dogmatic formula which has created spiritual life, but spiritual life which has led to formula, and as in the Roman Church formula has become corrupt in proportion to the decline of spiritual life, "Let us," said those modernists, "lead the spiritual life of the people back to its true source, place the conscience of the people in immediate contact again with the Christ of the Gospels, and the spiritualizing of wor-

ship, the restoration of dogmatic formula will follow as a consequence." To give form and body to this view, on the 2nd April, 1902, they formed a Society called: *The Pious Society of St. Jerome for the spread of the Holy Gospels*. This Society, which took the name of the great author of the Vulgate, prepared and widely distributed a new annotated translation of the four Gospels and of the Acts of the Apostles. The translation was in an easy and popular style; the notes were concise, reverent, and without polemic intention; the preface, clear and eloquent, set forth with great moderation and exactness the Protestant principles relating to the authority of the Scriptures; and perhaps for the first time since the Reformation, in it Protestants were called "our separated Protestant brethren." This nice little volume, printed at the Vatican press, and adorned with six engravings, contained, immediately after the preface, the beautiful passage out of the "*Imitation of Christ*" referring to *the spirit in which the Holy Scriptures should be read*,<sup>8</sup> and added some reminders and some instructions regarding the *reverent perusal of the Holy Gospel*.

It seemed as if the Society could not have commenced its work under better auspices. More than 200 bishops signified their approval of it, and many promised their assistance. Leo XIII granted an indulgence of 30 days to the faithful who read the Gospel for at least a quarter of an hour a day, and plenary indulgence once a month, on a day to be selected, to those who, for the space of one month, had dedicated a quarter of an hour daily to this reading. Later on, Pius X granted plenary indulgence on the feast day of St. Jerome to all those who, in any way whatever, belonged to the Pious Society. After three years of activity, the Society had circulated 300,000 copies of the Gospels in popular editions, first at 4 cents and then at 5 cents per copy; and to facilitate the circulation still more, it published the Gospels of St. Matthew and of St.

Luke singly, at 1 cent per copy. Moreover, to render the inspired writings more useful to the pious reader, it underlined many of the passages, which place in high relief the fundamental doctrines and moral principles of Christianity. In 1907, the 880th thousand of these books was issued from the Vatican printing press, and in 1908 the number cannot have fallen short of a million.

It must not be concluded, however, that everything went smoothly. The little volume, in its general aspect, with its index of passages from the Old Testament quoted in the New, with its little concordance and synoptic tables, its underlined verses, its illustrations and its price, savored too much of Protestantism to be palatable to some. The usual atrabilious press fell upon it, and began to denounce the Society of St. Jerome as one whose object was "a new and suspicious kind of propaganda." There is nothing more interesting, or rather nothing more contemptible and more sad to witness, than what went on behind the scenes in the Society of St. Jerome. There, in the background, the iniquitous conspiracy was woven by the eternal enemies of Truth, which was to extinguish a Society begun so auspiciously and with such promise of a glorious future. It was not enough that the unfortunate Society was presided over by a cardinal, and that its meetings were held in the Vatican; the Curia, as soon as it perceived that the fortunes of the Society were going to be very different from what it had expected, became diffident and nervous, and soon found a way of ridding itself of an institution, whose birth it had blessed, but which had been so ill-advised as to disturb its placid slumbers; and this, you may be sure, was done without compromising its own authority, or the "imprimatur" issued under the signature of Lepidi and Ceppetelli. It began by amending, touching up, correcting and lopping in its own way all the work the Society of St. Jerome had done. Later on, some of the notes disappeared gradually, some were mutilated and others were added to, so that they might mean what

they had not been intended to mean. The admirable phrase "our separated Protestant brethren," so Christian in spirit, and which aroused so much enthusiasm, was cancelled. Every allusion which the annotator had made to the Greek text, was ruthlessly expunged; and every breath of criticism or of independent opinion that appeared in the notes, was suffocated. Finally, in the last edition of the book (1911) a little "Manual of prayers" was added, containing the "Mysteries of the Holy Rosary," the "Litanies of the Blessed Virgin," several invocations to Mary and to St. Joseph, and a large number of ejaculatory prayers, intended as an antidote against eternal perdition for those who, peradventure, might have been poisoned by reading the pure and simple Gospel!

With its inquisitorial censure the Curia sought to render the work of the Society of St. Jerome innocuous, and at the same time dug and prepared its grave.

The end of the sad story can be told to-day in a few words. The Society of St. Jerome has not been dissolved by any express official act, but it has nevertheless been dissolved. The Curia has not killed the Society directly, but has so managed that it should expire gradually, slowly, and of itself. The noble members of the "Pious Society" have dreamt a beautiful dream, and nothing more; they have learned by painful experience that the Vatican fears a re-awakening of the people's conscience, and therefore does not desire the free circulation of the Gospel of Christ.

Now what should our Protestant attitude towards this reform movement be?

I think it cannot be but this: We must seek to understand these modernist priests; we must sympathize with them, without forcing them to leave the Church of Rome. Those born in Protestant lands and of Protestant parents can have but little idea of the point of view of those whose ancestral religion is Roman Catholicism, or of the working of a conscience which has been formed and educated in a Roman Catholic atmosphere. They who live in Christ

and have Christ living in them, cannot always understand the tenacity with which those priests, who have not entirely learned Christ, cling to the principle of an external authority, as a drowning man clings to a plank. The benefits that the Papacy rendered to Humanity in her darkest and most critical days, we take perhaps too little into account; and therefore we do not sufficiently appreciate how fascinating to those priests is the dream of seeing the historic organization of Romanism reconciled, some time or other, to the spirituality of primitive Christianity. In my opinion, it is a grave error to urge the modernist priests to leave the Church of Rome. It is wise to advise them to remain, as long as their conscience allows them to do so; wise to exhort them to persevere in their protests, to shake the foundations of the already tottering colossus, and to complete the ruin of that tyrannical authority which, for so many centuries, has dominated the conscience of the clergy and the laity. They must remain, and with all their strength complete, from within, that work of demolition and reconstruction, which we Protestants have for long looked for, and which we are seeking to accomplish from without.

Will the modernists ever succeed in their efforts? Will the world ever witness the realization of their ideal? Will the Church, so dear to their hearts, the Church they think responds best to the genius and temperament of the Latin races, the historic Church with her episcopal ritual, her strong ecclesiastical organization, her glorious traditions, her majestic cathedrals, will she ever be re-inspired with the Spirit of Christ, consecrated anew to God and to His worship "in spirit and in truth"?

To prophesy is always a difficult undertaking; in this case, it is more difficult than ever. Nevertheless, prophets and prophecies concerning the religious future of Italy are not wanting.

Let me mention two of those prophecies, which, without doubt, are among the most important.

Leone Caetani in the momentous pamphlet I have already referred to in my first article has a vision of that future, which is also a vision of many noble-minded and in every respect superior Italians. Let me try to sum up his idea in a few words. We must distinguish between religion and religious sentiment. Religion is the outward form, the material, passing phenomenon, perpetually changing with the times, places and the condition of the civilization of the various branches of the human family; religious sentiment, instead, is a universal, immanent, fundamental, and indestructible phenomenon of the human soul. Now, religions ruled over by a clergy with rites and dogmas, are social phenomena which will still have a long life, but are fatally doomed to disappear. Clergy, rites and dogmas, once upon a time, were necessary to human society, in the same way as despotic monarchy; humanity, in her moral infancy, needed special moral support to enable her to set herself up as a strong social organization; but nowadays humanity directs her course towards other shores, towards religious conceptions purely individual and subjective, free from all ritual ties, from all ecclesiastical laws, and from all sacerdotal interference. The social movement of our days opposes the principle of authority, and is spreading everywhere, in schools, in administrations, in the family, in the Church, and even in the Army. Nothing can stop it. Society aims at a far more stable equilibrium than that of the past; an equilibrium grounded on the respect for other people's rights, in order to obtain respect for one's own. The religion of the future will have to assume that fundamental characteristic. In a word: the religion of the future will have only one law: the inner will of every single individual; and one constant rule: the respect for other people's opinions and rights. In the new order of things the Church of Rome will be reduced to the condition of an innocuous sect of conservatives, without followers and without prestige.

Such is the most radical conception; the most revolutionary vision; a vision mixed up with true, as well as false elements. The vision is true, inasmuch as it admits the indestructibility of religious sentiment in man; but it is completely false inasmuch as it exaggerates religious individualism. The Spirit of Christ, when at work, is far from aiming at the isolation of those whom it inspires; it aims, instead, at uniting and binding them together in view of a great common work: namely, the triumph of the Kingdom of God; that is to say, the triumph of Goodness in the life of humanity. It is quite true that the Church of Rome, as she is now, is nothing but a political organization, and therefore a creation of the spirit of the world. But that fact does not render the other fact less true, that there exists a legitimate collectivity created by the Spirit of God. The pentecostal Spirit that filled the one-hundred and twenty in the "upper room," created the Church at the same time. It is in the very nature of the Spirit to act on this wise. If it is true that the Spirit sanctifies individuals, it is also true that it sanctifies them in order that they may form a spiritual body. The Spirit of God is not a spirit of egoism; it is a spirit of brotherhood.

The second vision I was alluding to, I may call: "The vision of the final triumph of modernism." It has recently found expression in a novel entitled: *When we, the Roman Catholic Church, will not die*, and written by Mario Palmarini. The novel has had a great success, which is greatly due to the fact that a few days after issue, the Curia condemned it, and placed it on the *Index*. For this is the way people reason in Italy nowadays: The books which the Church condemns, are always good; such and such a book has been condemned by the Church, therefore it is good; let us buy and read it.

The novel depicts things as they will be about fifty years hence. Pius X, is dead; Leo XIV, his successor, also dead; but, before dying, has ruined the Church completely. Meanwhile, modernism has continued its work

steadfastly, has invaded the Vatican, and has conquered the greater number of the Cardinals. The heads of the movement set their eyes on a Cardinal, Father Silvester, a modernist, a large-hearted man, and of truly simple, apostolic life. The conclave meet to elect the new Pope, and Father Silvester is elected with a very large majority. He assumes the name of Peter II. The new Pope writes a letter to the King of Italy thrilling with patriotism and deep spirituality; leaves the Vatican, and settles in his residence at Castel Gandolfo. He is often seen driving through Rome in his beautiful white motor-car; and on the 2nd of June, the great Italian national feast, he blesses the huge crowd in the square of Piazza Venezia, directing his eyes towards the colossal statue of the first King of Italy, the King of the revolution. On the 20th September, the date of the entry of the Italian troops into Rome, and therefore of the fall of the Pope's temporal power, he orders the national flag to be hoisted over Castel Gandolfo; and amid the astonishment and the admiration of the whole world, he purifies the Church from all old and new superstitions; directs the thoughts of the clergy into new and modern paths, and puts the consciences of believers in harmony with the teaching of Christ. The impression caused by this revolution is so deep, that the most rabid enemies of Christianity end by declaring themselves conquered, and by uniting their energies with those of Peter II and of the renovated Church, to help them in the welfare of humanity.

Palmarini's vision also has its weak points. It is useless to say that the colors are overdrawn, even more so than what may be granted in a book such as this, which is a battle-cry, in a novel which the author himself has called "heroic." But the weakest point of the book lies in the Christianity professed by Peter II. He is not a Christian; he is a pantheist; and his reform is to be carried out by love; but a love which is not a reflection of the love of God in man or a creation of the Spirit, but simply what our poor human love can be. Now, what

radical reform can one ever expect from a love such as that in a ruined Church like the Church of Rome?

Yet, notwithstanding the many and great shortcomings of the book, I trust that the reform of the Church of Rome will take place more or less on the lines indicated by Palmarini. Let modernism persevere in its work of infiltration, let it become more and more "Christocentric" in its faith, in its aspirations, in its Programme, let it organize itself in such a way as to envelop the whole Church in a thick strong net, such as that in which the "Carboneria" enveloped the States of Italy at the time of foreign bondage; let it continue to win the confidence of the best part of the laity; let the Protestant Churches of Italy come to understand the solemnity of the present hour and resolve to help earnestly, from without, the work that the modernists are accomplishing from within; and on the day in which God gives the historic Church of Rome a truly apostolic Peter II, far different from that of Mario Palmarini, you will witness most extraordinary events.

# BOOK REVIEWS

---

## I.—CHURCH HISTORY.

**The Fundamental Christian Faith. The Origin, History and Interpretation of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds.** By Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D., D.Litt. Scribners, N. Y., 1913. 332 Pages. \$1.50 net.

It is a curious commentary on the rapid changes that have occurred in recent years that Dr. Briggs, who figured not so many years ago in a very famous heresy trial, should have been counted before his recent death among the conservative theologians. Some of his own colleagues were far more radical than he. The work under review was his last important book, and its standpoint is distinctly conservative. It is, exactly what the subtitle indicates, a study of the origin, history and interpretation of the two great Christian creeds as the fundamental Christian faith. However far Dr. Briggs may have departed from current views of the composition and interpretation of the Bible he remained true to the divinity and Lordship of Jesus Christ. These convictions he sets forth in this book in the way of an interpretation of the creeds.

On many important points he takes issue with Harnack in his History of Dogma and with McGiffert in his work on the Apostles' Creed. He points out the fact that Harnack's position is determined by preconceptions of the nature of Jesus unfavorable to belief in His deity.

The learning of Dr. Briggs was indisputable. His work was always well done. In his later years he gave much attention to early church history on account of his own anomalous church relations. The present work is very valuable and ought to be studied along with Harnack and McGiffert when the creeds are under consideration.

The work is written too much from the standpoint of the Episcopalian—or even the Catholic—the standpoint of final ecclesiastical authority in the definition of doctrines in these great creeds. While rejecting this standpoint one must feel gratitude for the learning and patience which are manifest throughout the work. Its conservative position will contribute to a more satisfactory understanding of the creeds.

W. J. McGLOTHLIN.

**History of the Swiss Reformed Church Since the Reformation.** By Prof. James I. Good, D.D., LL.D. Philadelphia: Publication & Sunday School Board. 1913. 504 pages.

Although Switzerland is a very small country, its religious and political history has been very complex, even among the Reformed cantons. Zurich, Basel, Berne and the others have each a religious history which has differed more or less from that of all the other cantons. This want of unity in the history is necessarily reflected in the volume before us. A section on the general features of a period is followed by a detailed treatment of the events in the individual cantons. Nevertheless the general progress of events is kept fairly clear before the reader. Such a comprehensive volume on the history of Protestantism in Switzerland has been very much needed. Along with the broader outlines of the history there is much interesting detail concerning pivotal men and important ecclesiastical customs in the various cantons. Prof. Good has written extensively on various branches of the Reformed Church, but has probably not done a better piece of work than the volume under review. It is provided with a number of valuable cuts of men and places important in Swiss history. There are, however, a number of minor mistakes and infelicities of speech that mar the value of the book. On page 153 "sixteenth" should be "seventeenth" century; on page 114 and elsewhere there are mistakes in dates, usually but not always obvious. Such expressions as "hanging over precipices," "brought almost to the verge of war," "most fartherst," etc., are inelegant to say the least. The proof-reader also neglected his duty at many places. But the book is valuable,

very valuable to English readers who have had nothing very satisfactory on the history of the Swiss church since the Reformation.

W. J. McGLOTHLIN.

**Proof of the Pudding.** Autobiography of John Harmon Nichols, author of "Grub-Ax," "Pump," "Shipwreck," "Currycomb," "My Father's House," etc. Publishing House of the M. E. Church, South, 1913. 129 pages. \$1.00.

Two generations ago preachers of vigorous, original personality who took pride in their eccentricities and made spiritual assets of their peculiarities were found in many places. The author of this auto-biography is such an one come over into this generation. He has had a highly interesting and greatly useful career, marked by many dramatic features and experiences for which he has had a keen eye. He emphasizes "special providence," visions, angelic ministries and messages from and spiritual communications with departed friends. Many of these are recorded and all in a way to magnify the grace of God. Here is a work for the children of faith and one to interest the modern students of religious psychology.

The story is one of romantic interest and is well told under the form of a talk between the old preacher and a friend of his boy-hood days who, meeting him after many years, asks after his experiences.

W. O. CARVER.

**The Heidelberg Catechism: Historical and Doctrinal Studies.** By George W. Richards. Publication & Sunday School Board, Philadelphia. 1913. 363 pages.

This volume is published in celebration of the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the publication of the Heidelberg Catechism by the Reformed Church in the United States, the only body in America that holds to this symbol as both its authoritative statement of doctrine and its means of religious instruction. It has been one of the most important and useful of

all the catechisms, having served in the religious instruction of millions in Europe and America, and it is fitting that this anniversary should be so celebrated.

The work consists of a sketch of the rise and development of the catechumenate and catechetical instruction in the Church, the introduction of the Reformation into the Palatinate, and the composition, publication and the reception of the catechism itself. This part is purely historical. The following chapters contain the constructive portions of the book. First, the various doctrines of the catechism are differentiated from similar teachings among the Catholics, the Anabaptists, the Lutherans and the Calvinists. The next chapter undertakes to point out in some detail the relation of the catechism to the theological thought of the time. The following chapter deals with the principles of religious education as applied in the past and in the present. These two chapters constitute the most important contribution of the book and are very well done. The concluding section is a reproduction of the original edition of the Catechism along with the tercentenary English translation of the same. It is provided with notes by the author indicating points at which the translation could be improved, and they are all justified. A selected bibliography at the close is valuable.

W. J. McGLOTHLIN.

**The Beginnings of Quakerism.** By William C. Braithwaite, B.A., LL.D. 542 pages. Macmillan, N. Y., 1912. \$3.50.

Quakerism constitutes one of the most interesting movements in the history of Christianity. Its emphasis on spiritual religion and absolute equality and sincerity in all social relations is almost without a parallel. In recent years there seems to be a distinct revival of interest in the movement in its essential features far beyond the borders of the Quaker community. In like manner the Quakers themselves are taking greater interest in their own history. As evidence of this, one needs but to take up the admirable series of studies now being published by the Macmillan Company under the editorial leadership of Dr. Rufus M. Jones. The volume under review belongs to this series. It will

undoubtedly supersede all previous treatments of the early years of Quakerism. It has been written from the sources after a most painstaking re-study of all the material now in hand. All collections have been at the disposal of the distinguished author. The work has been done with sympathetic insight and yet without avoiding or glossing the more unpleasant features of the founder and the early history. In short the work has been done in a thoroughly scientific and yet really sympathetic spirit.

The history is carried down to the year of the Restoration, 1660. Another volume by the same author, now in preparation, is to carry the story on from that point. After an illuminating Introduction by Dr. Jones the author devotes a chapter to the conditions out of which Quakerism came. This is followed by a chapter on the early years of Fox. The succeeding chapters trace the growth and the spread of the work in Britain and Ireland, the sufferings and successes of the missionaries, the aims and the excrescences of the workers, the general attitude of the English people to the new movement. The last two chapters are devoted to the "Friends in Private Life" and "Quakerism at the End of 1660." Two Appendixes deal with the Journals of Fox and the Swarthmore Documents and the volume is completed by maps showing the Quaker progress to 1660, and by an excellent index. The volume as a whole is every way admirable and worthy of the men who are doing the work.

W. J. McGLOTHLIN.

**The Message of the Disciples for the Union of the Church; Including Their Origin and History.** By Peter Ainslie. Revell Co., New York, 1913. 212 pages.

This volume contains three lectures delivered before the Yale Divinity School and then submitted for criticism to three representative Disciples before publication. They represent, therefore, the corporate opinion of several prominent and representative members of the body on the subject of Christian union. This is set forth as the supreme need of Christendom to-day, overtopping in importance every other lack. At the same time there is no clear statement of what is meant by Christian union. It is to come by the abandonment of creeds and denominational

names, it is not to insist on any form of organization or worship, men of all shades of opinion are to be included. In short the principle of inclusion in a formless thing is to be the final solvent of the insoluble problem of Christian union. The author's conception of the importance of the question is seen in the following: "Above all the other issues of Christendom is the union of the Church of God." p. 21. He adds, "I do not mean a federation of the communions, as helpful as that is. I do not mean a mechanical union of all Christians, although that is far better than division, but I mean nothing less than a union like that for which Jesus prayed and without which the world cannot be won to Him." p. 21. But what is that? The author neither tells us what it is nor how it is to be attained. It is too vague to have real value. Again he says, "The only distinctive peculiarity of the Disciples now remaining is that the Disciples is the only communion that persistently seeks for unity by comprehension of them all." p. 28. But in what are they to be comprehended?

Nobody can doubt the sincerity of Dr. Ainslie's purpose. He freely admits that Mr. Campbell turned away from the original ideal of unity to that of the restoration of "the ancient order of things," and that the body as a whole has fallen below that aim in its efforts, often becoming as narrow and sectarian as any other. But he maintains, with truth I think, that the note of unity is again being struck with vigor. It is very difficult for this reviewer to believe that the total effect of Mr. Campbell's movement has been to further Christian union thus far on any basis other than absorption. If they have made men more brotherly, better able to understand each other, more tolerant of differences, that fact has not been observed. It is to be hoped that this is changing and that they will soon be able to make some real contribution in this direction. They have done fine work but they have done it as a denomination without succeeding in uniting with anybody.

If Christian union ever comes it will be along the line here proposed, but in the opinion of this reviewer the evils of denominationalism are greatly exaggerated in this book. Union will be

the fruit of growth into harmony and not the result of manipulation.

W. J. McGLOTHLIN.

**The Methodists.** By Prof. John Alfred Faulkner, D.D. New York: Eaton & Mains, 1913. 252 pages. Price, 50c, net.

This volume is a reprint of the one issued in 1903 by the Baker & Taylor Co., in a series of handbooks on the history of the leading religious denominations. It has had a useful career and is still one of the best brief handbooks on the history of Methodism. In the hands of the Methodist publishing houses it ought to have a very large circulation among their own people and render a very important service in the progress of the Kingdom.

## II.—BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

**The New Testament Documents: Their Origin and Early History.** By George Milligan, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of Glasgow. With twelve fac-similes. Macmillan Co., New York and London. 1913. 322 pages. \$3.50 net.

In 1911 Dr. Milligan delivered the Croall Lectures in Edinburgh which are now published in the present handsome volume. The book treats "The Original Manuscripts of the New Testament," "The Language of the New Testament Writings," "The Literary Character of the New Testament Writings," "The Circulation of the New Testament Writings," and "The Collection of the New Testament Writings." The lectures are readable and luminous in style while thoroughly scholarly and modern in treatment. The plates, among other things, illustrate well the papyri and the whole book is fresh with the smell of the dust heaps of Egypt and the new knowledge therefrom. The book is a delightful one for any student who loves the Greek New Testament and that ought to mean all serious students in the ministry.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

**St. Paul and Justification: Being an Exposition of the Teaching in the Epistles to Rome and Galatia.** By F. Brooke Westcott, of Trinity College, Cambridge. The Macmillan Co., New York and London, 1913. 397 pages. \$2.00 net.

The author is the son of the late Bishop Westcott. He has not attempted a formal commentary of Galatians and Romans, but more a study of the key-words in these great doctrinal Epistles. And yet it is exposition, not theology. The author has in mind the younger ministry whom he may really help. He makes little use of the books on these Epistles, as he himself says, and that fact gives a certain individual tone to his discussion while it limits somewhat the breadth and power of his work. But he is right in urging that men pay fresh attention to the words of Paul if they are to understand him and his message. The book should be useful.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

**Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos im augusteichen Zeitalter mit Berücksichtigung der paulinischen Schriften.** Von Hans Böhlig, Dresden. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen, Germany. 1913. 178 pages. \$1.50.

The present volume undertakes to define the background of Paul's life in Tarsus and forms a good supplement to Ramsay's Cities of St. Paul. It discusses in detail the heathen folk-religion (Baal, Zeus, Sandan), mysticism, the world-view, and Mithraism all of which entered into the religion of Tarsus. The book treats also the philosophy of Tarsus and the Judaism of Tarsus. However, it is still more or less problematical how much influence these various elements had upon the mind and life of Paul. But the author has done well a needed piece of work.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

**A Biblical History for Schools (New Testament).** By F. J. Foakes-Jackson, D.D., and B. T. Dean Smith, M.A. 1913. W. Heffer & Sons, Cambridge, England. 258 pages.

A useful handbook for schools we have here, for high schools and colleges, not for theological seminaries.

**Practical Studies in the Fourth Gospel; Vol. I.** By Warren A. Candler, D.D., LL.D. 1913. Smith & Lamar, Nashville. 298 pages.

The Bishop has done what he said he would do. He has made a series of helpful and forcible talks on the Gospel of John that are conducive of faith and Christian living. He promises a second volume to complete the series.

**The Men of the Gospels.** By Lynn Harold Hough. New York. Published by Methodist Book Concern. 98 pages. Price, 50c net.

The characters in this book are etched rather than described. As a thorough treatment it is, of course, inadequate. The moral values are strongly emphasized. It is interesting and valuable.

### III.—THEOLOGY, PHILOSOPHY AND APOLOGETICS.

**The Problem of Christianity: Lectures Delivered at the Lowell Institute in Boston, and at Manchester College, Oxford;** by Josiah Royce, D.Sc. (University of Oxford), Professor of the History of Philosophy in Harvard University. Volume I, The Christian Doctrine of Life, xlvi+425 pages; Volume II, The Real World and the Christian Ideas, vi+442 pages. New York, 1913. The Macmillan Company. \$3.50 net.

My experience with this work has been to me a peculiarly interesting one and I venture to outline it. For many years I have placed the distinguished author in the front rank of philosophic-al students in America, although not accounting myself a pupil or follower of his. The announcement of these lectures awak-ened most delightful expectations, for I looked to find here the fullest statement of his philosophy as wrought out under the new impulse already so manifest in "The Sources of Religious Insight." At last the opportunity arrived and I took it up with eagerness. The long preface—twenty-six pages—was more than a disappointment; it brought distinct shock. It seemed to me to breathe a spirit foreign to that I was accustomed to attribute to the author. Along with its outline of plan and method there was a frequent suggestion that the views of the work would be found novel and would likely meet criticism. Toward this criti-cism there was the mingled spirit of patronizing and of defiance,

along with that gracious gentleness and calm patience so obvious in former works.

It seemed to me that the author was determined to make Christianity a vehicle for bringing forward his philosophy of loyalty, the philosophy being true and so far final while Christianity must content itself with being either a form of this philosophy or a passing religion.

Then the attitude toward the Founder of Christianity was disappointing, for "the Church, rather than the person of the founder [N. B. the want of capitals], ought to be viewed as the central idea of Christianity." That sounded unpromising, not yet to say superficial. When I read that "this book has no positive thesis to maintain regarding the person of the founder of Christianity," I said: How then did it arise? Then I found that "this book \* \* \* has no hypothesis whatever to offer as to how the Christian community originated." Again the author affirms: "I have a right to decline, and I actually decline, to express an opinion as to any details about the person and life of the founder." Then, how is one to reach any adequate statement of "the Problem of Christianity" or to point to any true lines of its solution? So far then, I say, the preface has shocked me and made me skeptical. But I know too well that whatever the measure of my disagreements I am sure to find helpful spiritual insight, fruitful suggestion and it may even be revolutionizing reasoning. Of course, I went on. I can only briefly report what I have found, deeply conscious all the while how far the personal equation will be influencing my reading, and determined to keep open house for truth, or for messages that point to the truth. The preface has correctly foretold such positions as it has defined, but the context and development of the positions place them in fuller light that partly softens, but finally deepens, the feeling of sadness already awakened.

Three of the fundamental elements in Christianity find here statement and exposition of an order of excellence rarely met with. I mean: "the idea of the universal community," more accurately interpreted later as "the Beloved Community;" "the

Moral Burden of the Individual," rendering salvation by one's own effort absolutely impossible; and "the Realm of Grace," wherein help comes to save this helpless individual.

The supreme excellence of the book is its exposition of the idea of the Beloved Community, the Church of Paul and also, I believe, of Jesus in Matthew xvi. Paul's conception of the Church as the Body of Christ has never in history, so far as I am at all aware, had so true an interpretation as is found here; nor had its implications so well unfolded, its applications so fruitfully suggested. And yet the author fails to go to the depths of Paul's idea, because he lacks the love of Paul for the personal factor in the origin and the life of the Church. He sees it afar but refuses to draw near and grasp it in its fullness. With Paul it is an enthusiasm, with Royce an ideal; with Paul it was his life, with Royce it is his philosophy. To be sure it is a philosophy of life, but with the Apostle it is the gospel of life.

Both for comprehending and for practically accepting his idea of the Beloved Community our author inevitably needs what he stubbornly rejects, the Person of the Beloved as center, inspiration and life of the Beloved Community. The argument all the way involves this and it is hinted again and again, and yet it is not only not accepted but in the final chapter is definitely rejected. The spirit of the Beloved Community must take the place of the risen Christ of the Early Church and so take the place as to render Him useless, and all Christologies matters of indifference.

When the author declares (I. 417) that "Christianity not only is a religion founded upon the idea of the divine community,—the Church,—but also is a religion whose human founder was rather the community itself, acting as a spiritual unity,—than it was any individual man whatever," including Jesus Christ, he has gone about in a circle and said that Christianity founded itself; and he has laid himself fully open to the charge, suggested in his preface, of building an abstraction, suspended in the air.

That any one could discuss "the problem of Christianity" and think he was offering a solution to the problem while he ig-

nores Jesus Christ as an essential factor in the problem would be incredible did not the discussion lie before our eyes. The marvel is that the author so surely and so significantly apprehends the essential spirit of Christianity. His doctrine of the nature and end of the Beloved Community is eminently true. But now there are two questions to be solved: (1) How is the Christ related to this community? (2) How may the individual come into this community? Because Professor Royce will not answer the first he is unable to give any satisfactory answer to the second. Possibly his metaphysical conception of the individual is what hinders him at both points.

One unacquainted with the author's metaphysical presuppositions, the philosophy which has for its central ideas "Time, Interpretation, and the Community, and finally, The World as a Community" would be inclined to accuse him both of hopeless confusion and of rank unbelief; but in the light of the philosophy of being held by the author these judgments would be greatly modified. Nothing, however, can wholly save the discussion from inconsistency and inadequacy. There is a way out for him. He has followed Paul, or accompanied him if one prefers, far. If he will go all the way and will follow, too, to the end his own deep insight into the Logos of John and grasp the concept of the Eternal Christ and will then rescue his metaphysics from a too obvious tendency to impersonalism he will save both his philosophy and his Christianity.

The doctrine of community personality is developed with great insistence and vigor. Few will be found to go all the way with him here. Some will reject his lead altogether. But so far at least as the Beloved Community, the Body of Christ, is concerned, Paul will agree and not a few will follow if the personality of the spiritual Body be recognized as the Personal Spirit of Christ, indwelling and informing the still personal spirits of the members of the Beloved Community.

The work, let me say again and finally, is one of the most fruitful. I would that it might be read by every preacher and every man who is seeking the salvation of men and of society and who has sufficient knowledge of life and history to read this

book with any large measure of understanding and sympathy. I would particularly wish also that all law-makers and executives might read parts of Volume I.

I came to the close with a new sense of obligation to the author for enlarging my vision, quickening my spirit and inspiring my purpose to live for the Church for the sake of Him who "loved the Church and gave Himself up for it," loved humanity and died for it "that He might create in himself" out of its broken fragments "one new man."

W. O. CARVER.

**An Introduction to Philosophy.** By Orlin Ottman Fletcher, Professor of Philosophy in Furman University. New York, 1913. The Macmillan Company. xvii+420 pages. \$1.60 net.

This is a new sort of text-book for undergraduate students in philosophy. After a "General Introduction" it lays the basis in a brief—somewhat more than a hundred pages—outline of the history of philosophy. It then takes up the Elements of General Philosophy, dividing them into Epistemology and the Categories. Finally there is a division devoted to "Human Freedom and the Existence of God."

It will be seen that this is a very comprehensive course and must make a very full year's work for college students. To be sure the discussion is on a scale suited to the preparation of such students and its form adapted to them. The chapters are short. They average about ten pages but with no effort to make them artificially uniform in length. Sections are carefully marked and numbered and summaries close the discussions of the various topics.

The most engaging fact about the work is its declared and obvious purpose of teaching the student himself to think—to philosophize—about the problems of being. He is not merely taught objectively about philosophy. The aim is to reveal and encourage the student as engaged in the process himself.

One of the serious faults of current pedagogical theory is that the teacher is not to teach but to encourage development. Both are needed. This author has proceeded on the assumption

that his own position must be definite and known, not to coerce or even to convince students to agree with him but that they may feel that these problems can reach a state of peaceful progress toward satisfactory answer. Hence the author frankly avows himself "an objective idealist," and that is a very safe philosophical attitude for a teacher of young men. Professor Fletcher is to be congratulated and his book ought to be widely used and useful.

W. O. CARVER.

**A Brief History of Modern Philosophy.** By Dr. Harold Höffding, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Copenhagen; Authorized Translation by Charles Finley Sanders, Professor of Philosophy at Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa., Author of the English Translation of Jerusalem's Introduction to Philosophy. New York, 1912. The Macmillan Company. x+324 pages. \$1.50.

This translation is from the original edition of 1905 and it is a good thing to have the work accessible to English readers. Höffding has analyzed quite fully the modern movement of philosophical thought in Europe. The work is too brief to give much more than an analysis, but such an analysis is a splendid guide to the student and a splendid summary for the scholar. Some of the more recent movements have come to be better understood and their tendencies are more marked than at the time of the preparation of this work. Possibly some modification of the late phases would be needed.

One ventures also to suggest that the influences of Eastern thought might have clearer recognition.

Höffding's influence in modern philosophy is such that his interpretation of the history is of primary importance.

W. O. CARVER.

**The Principle of Authority in Relation to Certainty, Sanctity and Society.** By P. T. Forsyth, M.A., D.D. George H. Doran Company, New York and London. 475 pages. \$2.50 net.

No writer of this generation has more thoroughly analyzed the evangelical experience of redemption through Christ than

Dr. Forsyth, the author of this notable book. The principle of authority is discussed, as the title indicates, in relation to certainty, sanctity and society. I give in outline the leading points in the development of the argument.

Since Kant's day the notion of reality has displaced that of truth, the ethical has displaced the merely logical or theoretical quest for the meaning of the world. Facts rather than *a priori* principles of thought became controlling in research (p. 5). In Christianity the ethical has its primacy. God, the Holy, is the sole basis of the ethical. Philosophy cannot justify the moral ideal. Revelation must bring it to us. In Christianity revelation is redemption, a creative act of God in the soul. (p. 6-8). God, who, in and through Christ recreates us, manifests Himself thus as our religious object and as our final authority, and at the same time He makes us free. Religion requires reality in its object and God becomes real to us in the making of our personality, its recreation in redemption. The religious object is as real to us as our personality, which is the subject of its creative activity. Our certainty of God then is in a sense our certainty of ourselves, (pp. 31-32). Now God acts upon us through the revealing, atoning, redeeming cross of Christ. Our certainty is not a certainty primarily as to a truth but as to our state in a moral universe. It is not the certainty of an opinion or of an inference or judgment. It is rather the certainty of a reality in us, and acting upon us. Our assurance is not based on our experience but upon the object we experience (pp. 46, 47, 58).

Regeneration, which is God's miracle in us, is thus the basis of His authority, (p. 65). Only those who have the evangelical experience can understand the nature of this authority. In religion authority is absolute. Everywhere else it is relative. It goes back to the historic revelation of God in Christ and in particular to Christ's cross. And the cross is the atoning act of the all-holy One, and his method of dealing effectively with sin and guilt, and so of reconstituting the universe in the moral terms of the Christian redemption. Guilt, atonement and redemption are central in the problem of authority (pp. 75 ff.).

From the preceding it will be clear to all who are familiar with the issues of modern philosophic and scientific thought that Dr. Forsyth transfers the ultimate problems from the rationalistic to the experiential realm. In chapter V. he insists that theories of knowledge must wait on facts. The nature of the reality itself, not formal theories of how we know things, must determine our attitude. No psychology of knowledge can affect this conclusion. Our knowledge of God who meets us and redeems us is not the same as our knowledge of an object in nature. Through Christ God comes to us and thus the most real of all forms of existence becomes a part of our knowledge. Theology is the description of the experience of God and his redeeming grace which comes to us in Christ.

In chapter X. the author argues that the footing of religion is the real, not our experience, but what we experience. There is no access to the last reality save in the evangelical experience. The last reality is realized by a metaphysic not of being but of mercy, not of ethic but of the redeeming conscience of Christ. Existence is not a quantity but an act, an eternal moral act, an act of redemption (pp. 207 ff.). It is a question whether at this point the author has not left himself exposed to the charge that he makes sin and redemption therefrom essential constituents of being itself. He does not elaborate the point, but it would have been well to safeguard it.

The limits here do not admit of comment on the third section of the book. It abounds in fine insights, and in many a trenchant paragraph the author exposes the fallacies of the modern ideals of unlicensed liberty, of a tolerant kindly and useful God, and of comfort and success rather than strenuous effort and passion for the holy life. For the individual and the Church the Gospel of the grace of God is the outward authority which cannot be transcended. I would especially commend to the reader chapters XIX. and XX. on The Theology of Certainty and Theocentric Religion.

This book is the work of a courageous prophet who brings to the age a message it sorely needs. In his passion for the truth he advocates he elaborates his points sometimes almost to weariness.

ness. But he is never empty. It is the reiteration of amplitude of material, clearness of vision, and depth of conviction.

E. Y. MULLINS.

**Social Idealism and the Changing Theology.** By Gerald Birney Smith. The Macmillan Co. New York, 1913. 251 pages. \$1.25 net.

The title of the volume before us suggests its leading thought. "Social idealism" means that modern ethics is becoming increasingly social as contrasted with the onesided individualistic ethics of the past. "The Changing Theology" means that this modern socialization of ethics cannot be supported by the ecclesiastical ideal of authority in theology. There is an excellent account of the rise of the ecclesiastical ideal in chapter I. When it arose men were unable "to develop out of their own resources satisfactory generalizations for the guidance of life." The whole of the moral life came thus under the authority of the Church and ecclesiastical ethics held supreme sway during the middle ages.

This ecclesiastical ideal has been discredited in modern times by several marked movements: 1. the development of a secular theory of industry in which wealth is regarded in a new light in relation to the Kingdom of God; 2. the secularization of politics which renounces papal and ecclesiastical control in the state; 3. the changed position of the church in a secular state; 4. the secularization of modern scholarship according to which learning is no longer dominated by priestly and ecclesiastical control; 5. the rise of a secular ethics which renounces *a priori* principles in discovering ethical standards and seeks rather to discover the ethical needs of man in the evolution of the race through "an accurate analysis of that evolution, the sort of conduct which furthers the normal and wholesome progress of social and individual life." (p. 89); 6. the historical explanation of religion. There is not space here to outline the argument under these six heads. The general position of the author appears in the preceding statements.

In chapter three there is a suggestive discussion of the moral challenge of the modern world. This challenge is due to the

conception of evolution as the fundamental principle of history which sets aside the catastrophic explanation and the sudden advent of the messianic kingdom. It is due also to the development of scientific control of the conditions of life. The evils of life are subject to human control and a new sense of obligation as well as power has displaced the older ideal of simple submission to the ills of life as to the will of an inscrutable Providence. The moral challenge is also due to the new valuation of the physical conditions of the spiritual life. The physical is the basis of the spiritual and our total view must reckon with the physical if it is to be adequate. There has thus arisen a new view of industry, of wealth, and of legislation. The problem is to incorporate these new ideals into our Christian plan and program.

In the fourth chapter the author discusses religious assurance. He holds that religion lives not by its logical perfection but rather by its power to convince the heart. The ethical demands of the existing situation imply religious values which must not be overlooked. If we are to give religious guidance to the ethical life of our age and construct a vital theology we must give primary attention to the basis of religious assurance (p. 159). Theology must make its appeal to the moral conscience of men or remain impotent. We need not a new dogmatism based on reason, or authority. We are to formulate religious doctrines in accordance with the ethical requirements of life. In order to do this we must renounce the dogmatic and accept the scientific basis of assurance. We must adopt an "exact" method of discovering truth. Secular science supplies that method (p. 166-7). "The assurance of the scientist rests on the possibility of verifying or of revising all doctrines by the use of exact methods of research" (p. 167). Not results but the method of obtaining results is the chief consideration in testing our conclusions (p. 161). By the use of scientific and exact methods we might, after destroying all past achievements, work them out again for ourselves.

In the last chapter, on "The Ethical Transformation of Theology," the author emphasizes what he calls the "democrat-

izing" of ethics. All idea of a Divine force coming into human life from without is regarded as belonging to the aristocratic and priestly or sacramental conception of religion. The immanence of God in the natural order, human and cosmic, is held as being sufficient to explain the divine influences which transform life. Christ's origin is not necessarily transcendent in character. We discover God within our life as we share the God-consciousness of Christ (pp. 227 and 231).

This work is to be warmly commended for its firm, clear grasp of the modern ethical demands, and of the need for vitalizing theology. In the earlier chapters the author has stated with admirable clearness and force the moral movement of modern thought and life. The last two chapters deal too briefly with their themes to yield satisfactory results. They raise many questions which are not answered. There is nowhere in the book an adequate statement of the relations between our present religious life and the Christian origins, that is, the historical Jesus and the New Testament. The antithesis between Roman Catholic ecclesiastical ethics and modern ideals is admirably developed. But the implied antithesis between those ideals and the form of Christian life (I do not refer to doctrines) known as evangelical is not well grounded in anything in the book. Our insistence here would be simply that repeatedly urged by the writer, viz.: a "facing of all the facts" in a truly scientific spirit of open-mindedness. The author strongly advocates as the basis of religious assurance an exact scientific method. But he does not show how his religious conclusion is obtained by the application of such a method. This is really the *crux* of present discussions as to the relations between science and religion. The assumption that the exact methods of physical science are available in the personal and spiritual realm is, in the opinion of an increasing company of scientific men and philosophers, an unwarranted one. The two forms of reality, the physical and spiritual, do not yield themselves to identical methods. The doctrine of the Divine immanence as an exclusive principle of explanation breaks down. Undoubtedly it favors the plea that the exact method of physical science must be applied as the sole test of religious truth, since it identifies the spiritual universe with the

energy which indwells in nature. But it also deprives us of the power to rise above the natural plane. What in human experience is known as redemption involves a presence and power in the human will not previously there. It matters little whether it be conceived as a descent of God from above or a leap upward into human consciousness from below. In either case it is a departure from the ordinary process known as physical continuity. While, therefore we share heartily the moral passion and constructive ideals of this suggestive discussion we question the strength of the fundamental philosophic assumptions on which it is made to rest.

E. Y. MULLINS.

**Schleiermachers Aesthetizismus in Theorie und Praxis während der Jahre 1796 bis 1802; Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Werthung der aesthetischen Weltanschanung.** Von Lic. theol. Martin Otto Stammer. Leipzig, 1913, A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. Mk. 4.50.

Schleiermacher is of unfailing interest for philosophical, religious, and theological study. New books about him increase rather than decrease in number as the years pass. The aesthetic element in his system is here expounded. The discussion is remarkably clear in arrangement and comprehensive in the handling of the material. The author shows how close were the relations of Schleiermacher and the Romanticists, and how greatly he was influenced, especially in his youth, by the Romantic movement in his aesthetic views. Even in his later years religion was defined in terms of "feeling." But there was a great modification of Schleiermacher's youthful views as he grew in years, and as he grappled more closely with the profound problems of ethics and religion, and with man's need of redemption. There was not an irreconcilable contradiction between Schleiermacher's earlier and later views. These stand rather in the relation of flower and fruit. Yet he did pass from an earlier view, in which the aesthetic or artistic sense was given a very high place, to a deeper view in which it was clearly seen that the redeeming and sanctifying life-power for man is not to be found in art but in religion. The author insists that modern

aesthetic writers who cite Schleiermacher in favor of their view should recognize his transition in later years to the deeper and more radical view of the place of religion. I commend this as an admirable historical study of a vital theme.

E. Y. MULLINS.

**The Problem of Evil in Plotinus.** By B. A. G. Fuller, Sometime Instructor in Philosophy at Harvard University. Cambridge, At the University Press, 1912. xx+336 pages.

This is a careful, exhaustive, critical study of the Theodicy of Plotinus. The sources and influences of his thought are traced; the characteristics of his own psychology are presented; his arguments are given in extensive quotations and their strength and weakness indicated. Plotinus being one of the most serious of all students of this perennial problem, his work must have permanent interest, although the inconclusiveness of his reason was long ago manifest. The interest in it is now largely academic, but this work will be a splendid commentary for the study of Plotinus.

W. O. CARVER.

**What Is the Truth About Jesus Christ?** By Friedrich Loofs, Ph.D., Th.D. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1913.

Six Haskell lectures, given under the auspices of the Theological Department of Oberlin College in 1911, are published in this volume. The author undertakes to answer the question whether or not Jesus Christ was an historical person. Chapter one is a reply to Professor W. B. Smith, who, in his work, *Ecce Deus*, denies that Jesus existed. The Jesus-religion is based on a myth which conceived of a god as having become a man. Tradition invested the god with the necessary human qualities and gradually the fictitious portrait of the Jesus of the Gospels arose. Prof. Loofs examines the well known passages from Josephus, Tacitus, and other non-Christian sources and concludes that the historicity of Jesus can neither be proved nor disproved from these sources. But, apart from the Gospels, he

shows how I. Corinthians rests upon the most impregnable historical foundation, and from Paul he proves that Jesus existed.

Next the author examines the modern liberal view of Jesus which regards him as merely a man. On the basis of the Gospel of Mark and the document alleged by criticism to lie behind Matthew and Luke containing "sayings of Jesus" the author clearly proves that the modern liberal view of a simply human Jesus breaks down. The inevitable conclusion is pointed out that criticism must either admit the higher elements in the personality of Jesus or confess that it is impossible to arrive at any reliable knowledge of Jesus at all. Historical criticism, however, as a science must proceed on the assumption that human causes alone were at work in the Gospel history. When it finds other elements it can only confess its inability to handle them. Faith, however, can appreciate and explain these elements which lie beyond the reach of historical science.

The author points out the elements in the consciousness of Jesus which lift him above the human plane. He is unwilling to accept the statements of the doctrine of the Trinity and of the Person of Christ as found in the Nicene and Chalcedonian creeds, since he regards these as being in large measure the product of speculative philosophy and in some respects opposed to the New Testament representation. He holds, however, that God was present in Christ in a unique manner which lifted him to the plane of Lord and Savior, the arbiter of human destiny, one to whom it is right for us to pray. Professor Loofs mentions with much appreciation the view of the late Professor Kaehler which recognizes the inner distinctions in the Godhead without holding the older conceptions of three persons. On the whole, however, Loofs maintains an economic rather than an essential Trinity. At the same time he understands Jesus as the true revelation of God; that in him God was manifest in the flesh for the redemption of mankind. In the last resort Loofs is Ritschian in his conclusion that we have no means of knowing the essential nature of the Godhead, but at the same time he is not Ritschian in the definite assertions which he makes concerning Christ based on Scriptural teachings.

The book is exceedingly interesting as a fresh discussion of Christology growing out of recent critical views. It will strengthen faith in the reliability of the New Testament and in the reality of Jesus Christ as divine Lord and Savior. Loofs is not always fair or accurate in his interpretations of the Christological passages in Paul and John, but so far as he goes his conclusions in general are sound and Biblical.

E. Y. MULLINS.

**Great Ideas of Religion.** By J. G. Simpson. Hodder & Stoughton, London, New York, Toronto. 1912.

There are here six papers, originally published in the *Treasury Magazine*, and twenty sermons preached chiefly at St. Paul's in London. They cover a wide range of subjects: "Creation," "Sin," "Grace," "God's Difficulties," "Christ and Marriage," "The Burning Bush," are among the subjects discussed. The aim of the author is to present his various themes in the light of modern thought. He holds a religious philosophy which admits both necessity and freedom as facts in the universe. He is strongly ethical and social in his outlook upon society and hence recognizes in personality the fundamental truth of being. His views are not always clearly stated, but the moral and spiritual purpose is evident everywhere. The book will be found stimulating to many who will not accept all the conclusions.

E. Y. MULLINS.

**Religious Beliefs of Scientists, Including Over One Hundred and Forty Hitherto Unpublished Letters on Science and Religion from Eminent Men of Science.** By Arthur H. Tabrum; with an Introduction by Rev. C. L. Drawbridge, M.A., Hon. Org. Sec. of the Christian Evidence Society. Published by Hunter & Longhurst, London, for the North London Christian Evidence League, 1913. xxii+309 pages. 2/6 net.

This volume is in reply to a bold challenge by the Rationalist Press Association of Great Britain to the effect that practically all men of science were opposed to Christianity. It is not at all to be wondered at that Mr. McCabe, the agent of that

Association, seeks to discredit and discount these testimonies as presented in a former edition; nor that, failing that, he continues to make bold assertions contrary to facts. The energy of this Association in a bad cause, especially seeing it must employ methods condemned by any enlightened conscience, are a proof of the perversity of unbelief. This work has had no little to do with the fact that honorable unbelievers are now compelled to declare that "the Association can hardly be mentioned in any society of educated men without provoking sneers."

This enlarged and improved edition is welcomed with appreciation. It will be of great service in America as well as in Great Britain. Even those Christians who do not need it for the purpose of confuting rash rationalists and boasting unbelievers will be glad to read it for the fellowship in faith with eminent students of God's ways in nature. It is gratifying to know that the work has been translated into Russian and is now in its second Russian edition.

W. O. CARVER.

**Religious Unrest and Its Remedy.** By James A. Anderson, D.D., LL.D. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1913. 128 pages. 75 cents net.

Believing that "every generation must build its own intellectual habitation," and that in unusual measure our age has outgrown faith's terminology, the author outlines his faith in terms of the day. So we are led to expect, and one finds here a good degree of modernity. Yet many will appreciate the work all the more that it is rather more a defense of the old faith than a restatement of it. The eighteen chapters are necessarily brief and cannot but leave an impression of fragmentariness. While there is nothing especially original in matter or method in it, this little book brings a welcome reassurance for the average reader.

W. O. CARVER.

**Christian Faith for Men of To-day.** By Ezra Albert Cook, Ph.D. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1913. xiii+254 pages. \$1.25 net; postage 10 cents.

This is a very clearly written, straightforward statement of what the author regards as a possible and desirable faith for a

man of to-day acquainted with, and influenced definitely by, current scientific knowledge and theories. The fundamental appeal is to conscience and reason. Beyond that there is no authority. The Bible is approved as far the most valuable secondary authority for guiding reason and conscience. The positions suggested are defended on the pragmatic grounds of the value of such beliefs in the development of character. The conception is rather ethical than religious and the continuous impression is intellectualistic rather than vital. There is unnecessary effort to bring out negative aspects of the faith of modern men, denying some of the doctrines and experiences, conversion for example, that have been regarded as of the essence of Christian experience.

When the author insists that in order to believe in human freedom one must believe that God is ignorant of the decisions man will make in the realm of that freedom, his thinking is revealed as superficial.

The entire work is built on the assumption that the end of religion is to be sought wholly in the personal and social self-realization of man. The glory and honor of God are of no consequence. God is thus made an asset for humanity. This is one of the most insistent of modern attitudes. Those who accept it will find in this book an eminently satisfying elementary statement of the desirable faith for men of to-day.

There are at least two ways of determining what is Christian faith; one seeks to determine what the Christ was and taught; the other seeks to know what a man whose religion is historically connected with Christianity and so calls himself a Christian can believe about life, Jesus Christ, and the future. The latter is the method of this book, which pursues this method with real ability and marked clearness. It is arranged so as to be especially adapted for study by young men.

W. O. CARVER.

**Religionspsychologie und Apologetik.** Von Lic. E. Pfennigsdorf, Pfarrar in Düsseldorf. Leipzig, A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1912. Ss. 96. M. 2. Gb. 2.50.

This work is well reasoned and well arranged and lays especial stress on the practical, evangelical ends of apologetics.

Part I. deals with the value of the psychology of religion in theoretical apologetics. An historical and bibliographical study of the methods of the psychology of religion in relation to modern problems is followed by a summary presentation of the way this psychology can be employed in the various aspects of apologetic theory.

Part II. gives a good analysis of the personal religious psychology in dealing with individuals, dealing with the psychology of faith, of conversion, etc. Types are dealt with in detail on the basis of their psychological distinctiveness.

A second section of Part II. is devoted to the value of social psychology in dealing with classes, e.g., young people, agricultural, industrial and other classes.

W. O. CARVER.

**Modern Light on Immortality: Being an Original Excursion Into Historical Research and Scientific Discovery Pointing to a New Solution of the Problem.** By Henry Frank, Author of "The Triumph of Truth," etc., etc. Boston: Sherman, French & Company, 1909, 1911. 467 pages. \$1.85 net.

This truly original, independent and suggestive work in its second edition is enlarged and elaborated; but still intends to be followed up by the author's later "Psychic Phenomena, Science and Immortality." The work is ingenious in the use it makes of biology, evolution and physical science generally to construct a theory of the soul which provides for its possible independence of what is usually called matter, even though the soul is affirmed first of all to have a physical basis. The way is prepared for falling back on the author's theory by first showing, as he thinks, the utter futility of all philosophical and historical arguments and merely religious and ethical aspirations as bases for grounding the hope of immortality. Still it is not easy to see that even his own argument has anything more than probability, to say the most. It ought to be accepted, not as a substitute for, but as a complement to, other lines of approach to

a more definite conviction that the soul is essentially and ultimately capable of transcending the limitations of the material order. For all its scientific aspects, the author's theory depends ultimately on metaphysical, philosophical presuppositions and it applies the principles of these presuppositions at every stage of advance in the argument.

With much of the negative reasoning and particularly with much of the exegesis of Scripture the reviewer is not in accord; but the frankness and clarity of statement leave the reader at every point able at once to discern the writer's thought and to apprehend its confusion. This confusion is found especially in failure to distinguish substantive and adjective ideas in the notions of energy and matter. The work is one of fascinating interest and fertile suggestion.

W. O. CARVER.

**The Homing Instinct.** By Fred Clare Baldwin. 1913. New York. Eaton & Mains; Cincinnati, Jennings & Graham. 67 pages. 50c net.

There are many who raise little question about the rational ground of the hope of immortality. Those who do raise the question find their answer, if at all, along lines differing according to the differing temperaments, cultures and habits of the inquirers. The title to this little book sufficiently indicates the line of its answer. How this "Homing instinct" is supported by the Old and New Testament Scriptures and by spiritual life now experienced are indicated in chapters full of the poetic beauty of splendid rhetoric serving as vehicle for a buoyant and hopeful spirit.

W. O. CARVER.

**A Man's Religion: Letters to Men.** By William Fraser McDowell. 1913. New York, Eaton & Mains; Cincinnati, Jennings & Graham. 225 pages. 50c net.

These "Letters to Men" were first published in the Adult Bible Class Monthly. They richly deserve this permanent and connected form. They are rich in life and in expression. They

deal with vital matters in a way to appeal to the good sense, the manly spirit, the holy need of true men in all walks of life and in all stages of religious experience. I know nothing more to my liking for making the appeal to men to live a worthy life. Beliefs a man needs, ideals he must have, practices are his very self in expression. All these are his life and he needs to live that life in relation to God. This book will help him see God and see his own ideal in Jesus Christ.

W. O. CARVER.

#### IV.—RELIGIONS AND MISSIONS.

**Comparative Religion.** By F. B. Jevons, Litt. D., Professor of Philosophy in the University of Durham. Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1913. vii+154 pages. 40c net.

Nothing is more needed in the whole range of the study of Religion than a reliable and balanced work on Comparative Religion. This volume in "The Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature" is a movement in that direction and has many merits. It cannot, however, be said to meet the need. It was hampered by the narrow limits of space allowed in this series. Then the author is a philosopher rather than a scientist and the method of logic appears in this work to a considerable measure where we needed the methods of the historian and scientist. This defect appears at its worst in the chapter on Monotheism where inferences and logical implications abound but not in a way to convince.

Sacrifice, Magic, Ancestor-Worship and the Future Life are the topics on which the comparative study chiefly dwells. There are some original, valuable and very fruitful views advanced in connection with Buddhism and Mohammedanism. That sacrifice is a form of community worship and not of the individual; that to name one's God is to confess the existence of other gods, are views that are plausibly set forward but not supported by fact or by fuller results of analysis.

The work is fresh, independent, able but not satisfactory as a presentation of the facts of the religious. The superior place

it gives to Christianity is supported on somewhat unusual but very secure considerations.

W. O. CARVER.

**The Significance of Ancient Religions in Relation to Human Evolution and Brain Development.** By E. Noel. Reichardt, M.D., Lond. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company; London: George Allen & Co., Ltd., 1912. xiv+456 pages.

A "Germ-plasm," possessing a continuous, independent existence throughout a series of generations; with "two different kinds of elements," one giving rise to the individual and the other to a development determining the form and character of Racial movement is the physical basis on which this extremely interesting book builds up a theory of the evolution of human history. A Race is here a grouping of individuals dominated by certain common characteristics and always united by bonds of a common religious experience. The explanation of this is that all these individuals are products of a common wave in the evolution of the original stock of vital plasm. These waves have a life history, similar to that which is recognized in the individual, the duration of which in the group is about one thousand years. It has its stages of youthful vigor, flowering mid-life, decaying old age.

These waves rise, so to say, to different heights and make different types of manifestation because of different internal evolution, corresponding to the differences in the white and the gray cells in the brain, and the connection between the two. On this basis we have the two general types of subjective religions. Thus it is worked out that Judaism and Christianity are essentially different religions from the typical "primitive" religions, the difference either resting on, or associated with, a difference in the characteristic forms of plasm development in these racial waves of evolution.

This is the very romance of science and the work is one of compelling interest. Then, too, even apart from the reader's attitude toward the author's theory, the handling of the materials of religions and social history is instructive and suggestive.

W. O. CARVER.

**A Psychological Study of Religion: Its Origin, Function and Future.** By James H. Leuba, Professor of Psychology, Bryn Mawr College, U. S. A. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1912. xiv+371 pages. \$2.00 net.

By an inadvertence it was said in a notice of this work in our April issue that Prof. Leuba's classification of types of human behavior as; 1. mechanical, 2. coercitive, including magic, 3. anthropopathic, including religion, was developed by him in the preparation of his Doctor's Thesis. I regret this rather careless error. My characterization of the work, otherwise, while quite summary, represents my estimate of the work, which is one of extensive scholarship and learning but dominated by what seems to me a fatally defective method. In the main I indorse the elaborate and detailed criticism of the work in the *Princeton Review* of April, although it did not seem to me worth while to treat the work quite so seriously. I regret that in my absence this note was omitted in our July issue.

W. O. CARVER.

**Christian Science So-Called: An Exposition and an Estimate.** By Henry C. Sheldon, Professor in Boston University. New York: Eaton & Mains; Cincinnati: Jennings & Graham, 1913. 102 pages. 50c net.

Rather than "a critical estimate and appraisal of this modern cult" as the publishers designate this little work, it is rather a severe arraignment and a convincing demonstration of the unworthiness of the founder and of her claims. With keen analysis and unsparing criticism the author draws on the evidence supplied by Milmine, Peabody and others, and by the writings of Mrs. Eddy, and the irrational, immoral and absurd elements in her teaching. The work is keen and severe, but truthful and just. The criticism that Christian science involves serious hazard to mental balance is sustained by *a priori* considerations and not by concrete evidence.

W. O. CARVER.

**Sun Yat Sen and the Awakening of China.** By James Cantlie, M.A., M.B., F.R.C.S., Dean of the College of Medicine, Hong Kong

(1889-1896), and C. Sheridan Jones. Illustrated. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1912. 252 pages. \$1.25 net.

After twenty-five years of intimate knowledge of this Chinese Patriot, i. e. from his sixteenth year, Mr. Cantlie ought to be able to give a thoroughly reliable account of the man, his character, motives and fitness. He had known Sun as student and friend, had corresponded with him, talked with him, harbored him in the days when he was hunted the world over. With the aid of Mr. Jones to help interpret the new order in China we have here the work that thousands of students of current history in China were wanting. It may be the admiring friendship for Sun has caused too large a share to be attributed to him in the complex of personal and social forces that are making the new China. That seems to the reviewer to be the case. Time and study must reveal this. Meantime we all want to read this work.

W. O. CARVER.

**New Thrills in Old China.** By Charlotte E. Hawes, Presbyterian Missionary, Wei Hsien, Shantung, China. Illustrated. Hodder & Stoughton, New York; George H. Doran Company, 1913. 272 pages. \$1.25 net.

An autobiographical study of China before the Boxer uprising, an account of that terrible and significant experience, an account of the awakening and a moral and religious interpretation of the new situation in the old country: all this written in the fine style of a buoyant, vivacious spirit that rests deep in the faith of the God of Presbyterian theology and yet is vibrant in sympathy with the living present; such is this work on China. It is a good illustration of motives to missionary consecration, a study of the force of Christianity and a light on the social evolution of China.

W. O. CARVER.

**An Outline History of China. Part I, From the Earliest Times to the Manchu Conquest, A.D. 1644.** By Herbert H. Gowen, D.D., F.R.G.S.,

Lecturer in Oriental History at the University of Washington. Boston: Sherman, French & Company, 1913. 208 pages. \$1.20 net.

Nothing in literature concerning China was so much needed as a history of the people. This volume puts within reach of all a very well-arranged and well-proportioned account of the people and of the numerous dynasties. It is not a mere chronology but a vital picture of the life. Of course it is only an outline. But that is what most people will need. The reader will very frequently feel that more should be told. The author has used freely the popular works on China, but also some far less known in this country. His treatment of religion is very slight and one must think rather superficial. He falls into the easy error of making Lao "the founder of Taoism." There can not as yet, if ever, be any clear distinction between fact and legend in much of China's history. This work will do a fine service in informing many of the main facts of China's long career.

W. O. CARVER.

**Human Progress Through Missions.** By James L. Barton, D.D., Foreign Secretary of the American Board; author of "The Missionary and His Critics," "The Unfinished Task," "Daybreak in Turkey," etc. New York, 1912. Fleming H. Revell Company. 96 pages. 50c net.

The fact is getting to be widely recognized that Christian Missions, as a sort of series of "by-products," have contributed to all phases of human advance, the world over. This has been elaborately set forth in the great work of Dennis and treated in several works. But the average preacher and worker does not know just how to make use of the fact as an apologetic and as an inspiration for missions. This work by Dr. Barton is especially to be welcomed because it meets just that need.

W. O. CARVER.

**The Modern Call of Missions: Studies in Some of the Larger Aspects of a Great Enterprise.** By James S. Dennis, D.D., New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1913. 341 pages. \$1.50 net.

This is the fitting title for a volume of essays and articles previously published in magazines and elsewhere. The author

is one of the best known and most popular advocates and interpreters of Modern Missions. The subjects here treated have been treated by him in previous volumes and there is here little new from him, except in the matters touching Mohammedanism and missions in the Nearer East, to which are devoted six of the eighteen chapters.

The relation to missions of diplomacy, commerce, colonization and national evolution are some topics of great interest.

Of especial interest is a chapter on "The Hymnody of Modern Missions."

The wide range of topics, the clear and vigorous discussion and the wide range of the author's investigations make the volume one of distinct value to agents and advocates of this great enterprise.

W. O. CARVER.

**The Soul of India: A Study of Hindu Religion in Its Historical Setting and Development, and Its Internal and Historical Relations to Christianity.** By George Howells, Principal of Serampore College. The Kingsgate Press. 5 shillings, net.

Many a pioneer is discouraged as he gropes his way through the jungle. If he has the patience to win through, blazing the true track, and the perseverance to return and widen the path, all his successors will call him blessed. Now Dr. Howells found when he tried to equip himself for missionary work in India, that an understanding of the land, the people, the religion, had to be painfully acquired, both by residence and by prolonged study of many books in many languages. He has distilled the result into 644 pages of wonderful value, which will save every future missionary to the Hindus possible years of misdirected energy, and will give any intelligent reader some conception of the kind of work that has to be done, and the success already achieved. He sets forth how the Aryan invaders brought the first religion to India which rose above mere animism, and has left literary traces. He shows how just before Alexander, Chandragupta unified the land and reigned over a great empire from Patna. He tells how the first native "religion," Buddhism,

was patronized by Asoka and had its palmy days from 272 B.C. to 375 A.D. He depicts the elaboration of Sanskrit and the rise of the Brahmans towards an empire of thought, and shows how Sankara worked out a philosophy which spread over all India, for the first time leavening the Dekkan. He acknowledges the price paid for this, the compromise with countless degrading local cults, the extension of "caste" from four leading divisions to what were lately 2378 social classes, each in a watertight compartment. He tells how when Buddhism was extinct, new reforms came; from the outside the Muslims with a new state religion, from the south such leaders as Ramananda who appealed again to the people in their own spoken tongues. And finally he sketches the result of European civilization for the last two centuries. On this foundation Dr. Howells builds such original work as may be expected from a graduate of five universities. The account given of the evolution of religion and philosophy is most lucid; the comparative study of Hinduism and Christianity brings out first the common ground, and then the defects of Hinduism, in a way that will enable a missionary to see the sympathetic mode of approach; specimen dialogues with a villager and with an educated Hindu are most illuminating. Finally he studies the historical contact of the two religions. His conclusion that the Bhagavad Gita, whose limits of date are 200 B.C. and 200 A.D., shows a general knowledge of the apostolic preaching, and a literary acquaintance with the fourth gospel, has implications for other than missionaries. And it will be news to many that the great reforms of Taloi Das and others of his school, were inspired by contact with the Christians of St. Thomas in the south. He quotes the French estimate of the result of Roman missions, that for sixty years before 1823 not one single proselyte had been made. His own view of Protestant missions is that the first century of voluntary effort yielded four-fold the result of a century of Catholic state-aided work; that the lower classes are most accessible, that the upper are well leavened. His last pages have counsels for every class; he begs the home supporters to lengthen the ropes and not keep the missionaries dangling in the air, and he warns against mushroom

organizations which cannot deliver the goods. The book deserves the closest study of every embryo missionary—or pastor.

W. T. WHITLEY.

**The Call of India: A Study in Conditions, Methods and Opportunities of Missionary Work Among Hindus.** By the Rev. Edgar W. Thompson, M.A., author of "A History of India," etc. London, 1912. The Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society. xv+319 pages. 1/6 net.

This little volume in the mission study series of the British Wesleyans is truly a *multum in parvo*. The author is a gifted and experienced writer and has not only crowded a deal of information on all essential phases of the Hindu people and religion into his book, but has done it with an attractiveness of literary style quite unusual in the mission study books.

This work ought to have a reading quite beyond the limited circle for which it was primarily written. The work undertakes to treat of Hinduism alone of the religions of India.

W. O. CARVER.

**Lotus Buds.** By Amy Wilson-Carmichael, Keswick Missionary G. E. Z. M. S., author of "Things as They Are," "Overweights of Joy," "The Beginning of a Story," etc.; with fifty halftone illustrations from photos specially taken for this work. George H. Doran Company, New York, 1912. 340 pages. \$2.00 net.

This edition places within reach of people of more moderate means this delightfully original and widely useful work, heretofore published only in limited, exclusive editions at a necessarily high price. The author won instant recognition with her first work and is long since past the need of a reviewer's praise. We need only express our gratitude that this work is now accessible to all who love children and missions; for the Lotus Buds are the little girls of South India rescued from the shame of heathen temples.

W. O. CARVER.

**Planting the Outposts: Thirty-five Years Among the Children of the Plains.** By Robert Frederick Sulzer, District Superintendent of Pres-

byterian Sunday-School Missions for Minnesota and North Dakota; with illustrations. Philadelphia, 1913. The Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work. vii+133 pages. 50 cents; postage 8 cents.

This work is one of rare interest. It is arranged for a study course but is better adapted to general reading. It is an account of some of the experiences and successes of a man of the most limited education, original and initiative personality, profound consecration and a great fund of "common sense." Of course, such a man has practical humor. They always do. His humor and all else were assets for Christian service in the work to which he was led of the Lord and in which he was greatly used. The Presbyterians are justly proud of and grateful for this very unconventional German worker.

W. O. CARVER.

**Comparative Religion: Its Origin and Outlook; A Lecture.** By Louis Henry Jordan, B.D., Member of the Institut Ethnographique International, Paris; author of "Comparative Religion: Its Genesis and Growth," etc., etc. Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, London, New York, etc., 1913. Pamphlet, 16 pages. One shilling net.

This is a brief account of the subject indicated and a somewhat extended review of the recent volumes on Comparative Religion by Dr. Jevons, and Principal Carpenter. The work is scholarly but unfortunately marred by that oracular, patronizing air with which the author's readers will be familiar.

**Religion and Life.** By Thomas Cuming Hall, Professor of Christian Ethics, Union Theological Seminary, New York. New York: Eaton & Mains; Cincinnati: Jennings & Graham, 1913. xiv+161 pages. 75c net.

This brief study of religion is remarkably comprehensive, discussing the origin, development, factors and functioning of religion. It is clearly written and thoroughly scholarly in method and grasp.

**The Civilization of Ancient Mexico.** By Lewis Spence. Cambridge, At the University Press; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912. xiii +121 pages.

This handy little volume in "the Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature" is by a recognized specialist in its field. While little is really known of early Mexican peoples the author has handled well what is known and an intelligent reader will be able to discriminate between assured facts and what is merely good guessing. The work is one of much interest. Pictures, maps and charts add to its value.

**Inside Views of Mission Life.** By Annie L. A. Baird, Missionary of the Presbyterian Church at Pyeng Yang, Korea. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1913 . 138 pages. 35c net.

This is just what its title suggests to the intelligent student of missions. The author tells frankly what rarely finds any public expression; the temptations, the trials, the occupations, the diversions and social life generally, and the joys of missionaries.

In the lines of this book you see the missionaries as plain human beings without romantic glamour through which most people view them.

**The Progressing Philippines.** By Charles W. Briggs, Missionary in Panay and Negros, 1900-1910. The Griffith & Rowland Press, Philadelphia, 1913. 174 pages. 50c net; postage 8c.

This is a mission study text-book. There are ten chapters dividing among them the chief topics of concern about the Philippines for the Christian. More than forty illustrations and maps add to its value. The amount of information packed into the pages is quite remarkable; and there is a good bit of the philosophy of religion and missions as well.

**David Livingstone.** By C. Sylvester Horne, M.P., with illustrations. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913. viii+248 pages. 50c net.

Mr. Horne has done a fine service in presenting the characteristic and strategic facts of the life and work of Livingstone and of his character and his service to humanity. And the Macmillans have done a fine service in publishing the work in their "Standard Library." With fine discrimination, with skill in dramatic simplicity, Mr. Horne has made the great hero of Africa live and has brought into bold relief the moral qualities and lessons of his life.

**The Song and the Soil: Or, the Missionary Idea in the Old Testament.** By W. G. Jordan, B.A., D.D., Professor of Hebrew in Queen's University, and Professor of Old Testament Criticism and Exegesis in Queen's Theological College, Kingston, Canada; author of "Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought," "Prophetic Ideas and Ideals," etc., etc. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913. viii+142 pages. 60c net.

A highly interesting and useful study of some of the great missionary passages of the Old Testament. It must be said, however, that the work is as remarkable for what it has overlooked as for what it has used in its field.

The volume belongs to the "Short Course Series."

**Lantern Stories.** By Lena Leonard Fisher, Being Little Stories of How Some Children with the Light Tried to Show the Way to Others Who Had No Light. New York: Eaton & Mains; Cincinnati: Jennings & Graham, 1913. 96 pages. 50c net.

Eight short, interesting stories calculated to instruct and especially to interest children in the needs of heathen children and foreign missions.

**Children's Missionary Stories.** Collected and compiled by Alice Moreton Burnett, Corresponding Secretary for the Woman's Board for Home Missions, Christian Church. Dayton, Ohio: The Christian Printing Association. 128 pages.

Here are nearly three dozen stories and poems wisely selected for use with children. They are chiefly foreign missionary stories, by many authors and drawn from many sources.

## V.—PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

**Baptists and Their Doctrines: Sermons on Distinctive Baptist Principles.** By B. H. Carroll, D.D., President Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Compiled by J. B. Cranfill, LL.D. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1913. \$1.00.

To those of us who have long known and loved Dr. Carroll, and frequently have enjoyed his great sermons at the Southern Baptist Convention, this volume will afford real delight, as well as spiritual uplift and mental illumination. I have read with increasing pleasure every word in this volume. In some of the majestic and sweeping passages, one can see in imagination the towering figure and kingly face of the great preacher.

The volume consists of one sermon on the Church, three upon the Resurrection; four upon the Judgment; one article upon "Distinctive Baptist Principles," and one upon "The Baptists One Hundred Years Ago." The two latter productions ought to be put in tract form and widely distributed. No loyal Baptist can read these two mighty deliverances without his heart burning within him; and his desire to maintain and extend these great doctrines will be vitally quickened.

P. T. HALE.

**Evangelistic Sermons By B. H. Carroll, D. D.** Compiled by J. B. Cranfill, LL.D. New York, 1913. Fleming H. Revell Co. \$1.00.

This volume is just what by its title it purports to be; a series of "*Revival*" sermons. The style is clear and captivating, and the matter of the discourses eminently scriptural, evangelical and evangelistic. The eminent preacher shows the versatility of his genius in the simple, direct, and luminous style in these discourses. They are carefully prepared and any layman as well as any minister of the word, who desires to "win souls" will be greatly helped and stimulated by their perusal.

P. T. HALE.

**The Word of the Cross, and Other Sermons.** By A. B. Macauley, M.A., Stirling. Hodder & Stoughton, New York and London. \$1.50 net.

This is a handsome volume of twenty-four sermons, the text of the first of which, gives the title to the book and is the Revised version of I. Cor. 1:18. The author's interpretation is, that the cross is speaking and its word, i. e., its utterance, is the truths of the Gospel. This vein of uniqueness and striking originality, runs throughout the entire volume, and there is a charm and piquancy about all these twenty-four discourses which render them quite readable. There are also evident a devoutness and sincere earnestness which enthrall the attention of the reader. The style and view-point of our British brethren—especially those of other denominations—are so different from our own, that it is helpful occasionally to read their sermons.

P. T. HALE.

**A Vital Ministry: The Pastor of To-day in the Service of Men.**  
By W. J. McGlothlin, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Church History, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. New York, 1913. Fleming H. Revell Company. \$1.00 net.

The clue to the thought and purpose of this book is found in the following sentences from the Preface. "No other phenomenon \*\*\* has so impressed him [the author] as the baneful effects of ecclesiasticism." "Above all things we need to-day a ministry that can speak to the men of to-day, a ministry that will not be confused or turned from the main matter by the persistent demands of a beaten but resolute ecclesiasticism." The book throughout is a call to preachers to remember that their business is not to support or defend or promote an institution or a creed, but to develop spiritual life in men. The author recognizes the necessity for Christian institutions and Christian beliefs, but insists that they are of instrumental value only. The end is life; and when the minister loses sight of this fact and puts the primary emphasis upon institutions and creeds, these become the most effective obstructions of the purpose for which they were instituted. Life, large, rich and full, is the main thing, and the preacher needs continually to be reminded of this capital truth.

After a suggestive chapter in which he treats the general aspects of his theme, Dr. McGlothlin discusses the minister in his relation to truth, theology, the sermon, worship, Christian architecture and art, the Bible, his church and social questions—covering thus the various fields of the preacher's activities and making vigorous application of his fundamental principle. Truth and theology, the sermon, art, the church building, the church itself, even the Bible are regarded as instrumental to life.

The discussion is eminently sane and balanced. It is not radical and it is not reactionary. It is a strong and timely effort to focus the attention of preachers upon their supreme and glorious, though most delicate and difficult, task. One cannot but be impressed by the tone of earnest conviction that characterizes the book, nor read it without realizing afresh that the ministerial function is a high and holy one and feeling a renewed impulse to give himself with entire consecration to its central task—to build up life.

Now and then one comes across an expression or a sentence which he could wish were more discriminating or less sweeping. For instance, the statement is made that "the things which divide age from age, race from race, class from class, country from country, sect from sect, are accidental, superficial and ephemeral.". Of course, there are essential elements that are common to men in every age, race, country, and sect; but it seems too strong to say that the things that distinguish them from one another are either accidental, superficial or ephemeral. However, it does not seem to me that much exception can be taken to the positions maintained in this book without fairly laying oneself open to the charge of hypercriticism.

The book is worthy of a wide reading by preachers and by laymen who are intelligently interested in the work of the preacher.

C. S. GARDNER.

**Religion As Life.** By Henry Churchill King, D.D., LL.D., President of Oberlin College. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913. v+194 pages. \$1.00 net.

Dr. King is one of our most prolific authors in the realm of vital religion in relation to current conditions. In this volume he has brought us the finest fruit of his thinking. It is an intimate, personal study, that searches, calls and urges on. Its concept is that which is most fundamental in religion. It deals with the *choice, method, realities, sources, enemies and essence of life*. One regrets that the vigorous style is not always maintained and the reading, therefore, not always compelling. But the fault is not grievous and the work is one for every man who wants to live and help others to live.

W. O. CARVER.

**A One-Sided Autobiography.** By Oscar Kuhns. New York: Eaton & Mains, 1913. 236 pages. \$1.00 net.

A lover of books here tells what books have done for him. These pages are wholesome and stimulating reading especially for earnest young people who wish to develop in themselves an appreciation of literature. The author has read widely of all kinds of books ancient and modern. Modern books have not shaken his serene confidence in the eternal verities of the spiritual world. These are assumed rather than debated in this volume. It is a pleasure to read this simple personal narrative of a life moulded by the ideals of the best literature and of Christian faith, especially in an age when so much is published that is raw and amateurish on the spiritual side by those who make great claims to scientific achievement.

E. Y. MULLINS.

**Christianizing the Social Order.** By Walter Rauschenbusch. Macmillan Co., New York, 1912. 493 pages. \$1.50.

Few books on serious themes have enjoyed a wider reading than "Christianity and the Social Crisis." One of a great stream of books on social subjects it has had a distinct and sensible effect in arresting attention and arousing the conscience of Christian people. It has borne and continues to bear fruit. The present work is supplementary to the former. The title would seem to

promise a solution of the vexing problems of modern life. Most Christians would agree that the social order ought to be Christianized, but they stand appalled by the *how?* Where are the forces sufficient to accomplish the Herculean task? What are the methods to be employed? Answers to these questions we constantly seek, but do not find adequately expressed in this volume.

As in the former work there is here a wonderfully beautiful and attractive style—trenchant sentences, apt illustrations, prophetic passion, burning indignation. Capitalism is arraigned as only a man of extensive knowledge of social and economic conditions, profound sympathy for the toiling masses, and a passion for righteousness and justice can arraign it. The author is a prophet, a poet, a reformer, a socialist, all in one. With wonderful force and clearness he points out ways in which the materialism of our times lays its blighting hands upon the fairest fields and richest fruits of human endeavor—on art, dress, the professions, the press, literature, etc. It is a great arraignment, a searching diagnosis. The condition of the patient according to the diagnosis is most distressing and dangerous. One is overwhelmed with apprehension and pessimism. But the doctor does not seem to be at all assured of a remedy; indeed he too is pessimistic. It is here that the book, like the earlier volume, seems to the reviewer to be seriously defective. It leaves the reader depressed and despairing, rather than stimulated to a renewed and greater effort. After reading these works he needs the tonic of some other works that marshal the forces that are operating mightily for righteousness and goodness in modern society. It is impossible to believe that the case is as hopeless as it would appear to be in these two volumes.

But it must be said that this work is not by any means wholly pessimistic. The first two chapters treat very briefly the social awakening in public life and in the churches, and there is here much to stimulate hope. But most of the volume is devoted to the exposition of existing conditions and setting forth the changes which are necessary to Christianize the social order. One stands before the conditions, dumb and overwhelmed by the

magnitude and difficulty of the task, lacking both power and method for its accomplishment.

In the last chapter the author recognizes, it seems, the danger that the reader will feel that the book is only another cry of socialism. But he maintains that "this is a religious book from beginning to end. Its sole concern is for the Kingdom of God and the salvation of men." The Kingdom of God "means the progressive transformation of all human affairs by the thought and spirit of Christ. And a full salvation also includes the economic life." p. 458. "It is not this or that thing our nation needs, but a new mind and heart, a new conception of the way we all ought to live together, a new conviction about the worth of a human life and the use God wants us to make of our lives," p. 459. Notwithstanding these statements the reviewer cannot escape the feeling that the dynamic of the book is humanitarian rather than religious. That there is a splendid and contagious enthusiasm for humanity must be recognized; but that this rests upon a religious basis is not so apparent. To feel this keenly one needs only to compare its pages with Amos, for example, where the religious motive is brought to bear upon the social questions of that day. We still wait for the social prophet who can bring God into modern society.

W. J. McGLOTHLIN.

**Syndicalism: A Critical Examination.** By J. Ramsay Macdonald. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company.

"The book is based upon six articles on Syndicalism which appeared in the *Daily Chronicle* during May, 1912."

Syndicalism is the form which the labor movement has taken chiefly in France. Its theory is that the State is a capitalist institution and that the laboring class can hope for no benefits through political action. Its program is the "general strike." When laborers shall become generally organized and unified, and shall all at once lay down their tools, they will bring all the activities of society to a standstill. Thus capital will be brought to its knees and laborers will take charge of all the means of pro-

duction. The futility of the program is clearly pointed out by Mr. Macdonald.

Syndicalism has its chief home in France; but as a matter of fact it can claim only about 400,000 out of 11,000,000 wage earners of that country. It is weak in America, England, and elsewhere in Europe; and the author does not think that it amounts to more than a dream. Perhaps he underestimates its importance; but a great economic revolution is not likely to come about by that method.

C. S. GARDNER.

**History of the Baptist Young People's Union of America.** By John W. Conley, D.D. 144 pages. 50c net, postpaid.

**Baptist Young People at Work.** By Frederich G. Detweiler. 142 pages. 60c net, postpaid. Philadelphia: The Griffith & Rowland Press, 1913.

These are valuable and timely volumes, which, as their titles imply, deal with the unfolding and progress of the Baptist Young Peoples' Union of America; its genesis, epochs, achievements, status and prospects, and with the organization and practical working of the local B. Y. P. U.; its social, devotional, educational and missionary program. The authors have done their work well and deserve the gratitude of their constituency.

B. H. DEMENT.

**The Devotional Life of the Sunday School Teacher.** By J. R. Miller, D.D. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. 1913. 50 cents.

With characteristic directness and simplicity Dr. Miller treats of several vital aspects of the Devotional Life of the Sunday School Teacher. The completed manuscript was found among the papers of the author after he had gone from his earthly labors. In nine chapters, 110 pages, he presents, Sacredness of the Teacher's Work, The Teacher's Aim, The Spiritual Element in Teaching, The Teacher's Life as a Factor, etc., in a way helpful to Sunday School teachers whose spiritual life and

conception of their work would be improved and enlarged by a careful perusal of this little volume.

B. H. DEMENT.

**The Angel in the Corner, and Other Addresses to Children.** Rev. C. E. Stone. London: Hunter & Longhurst. 2/6 net.

In these forty-two addresses the author reveals considerable knowledge of child nature and presents Biblical truth in lucid style which has quick movement and practical bearing in the sphere of childhood activities. The volume is unnecessarily marred by excessive spiritualizing which militates against a real understanding of the Scriptures. The very title of the book is an illustration of this fault. The author is at his best when he does not strain a passage to make it bear his message, and in the main this is his method of procedure.

B. H. DEMENT.

**The Broader Vision.** By Richard Sill Holmes. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1913. 232 pages. \$1.00.

The daughter of the author has presented a brief, graphic biography of Dr. Holmes, and given the public a valuable miscellany of the varied literary activities of her distinguished father. The short prose articles have appeared as editorial material, while the poems are gathered from many sources. There are Life Lyrics, Holiday and Anniversary Poems, a Group of Sonnets, and Sparks from the Thought Anvil.

B. H. DEMENT.

**Learning to Teach from the Master Teacher.** By John A. Marquis, D.D., LL.D., President of Coe College. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1913. 79 pages. 35 cents.

President Marquis has shown himself a master of a concise and suggestive style in a brief and practical discussion of Jesus the Master Teacher. It is a worthy hand-book for Sunday School teachers.

**Spiritual Culture and Social Service.** By Charles S. Macfarland, Secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co.

This is a reprint of a series of discourses delivered by Dr. Macfarland before he gave up the pastorate. They are clear in thought and deeply spiritual in tone, and they set forth in an attractive way the spirit and motive of Christian social service.

**The Heart of Prayer.** By Charles W. McCormick. 1913. New York: Eaton & Mains; Cincinnati: Jennings & Graham. 25 cents.

This is a most attractively gotten up little pamphlet that undertakes to reach the centre of the function and power of prayer. It follows the right line and will serve to guide troubled souls. Prayer's main use is to prepare the way in men for the doing of the will of God.

**The Church and the Changing Order.** By Shailer Mathews, Professor of Historical and Comparative Theology in the University of Chicago; author of "The Social Teaching of Jesus," "The Messianic Hope in the New Testament," etc. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913. viii+255 pages. 50c net.

After five years of success, with its fifth printing this popular and useful work is now included in "The Macmillan Standard Library." It should have a greatly extended reading at this time; for it is one of the safest and most suggestive works dealing with this pressing subject.

**The Building of the Church.** By Charles E. Jefferson, Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City. New York, 1913. The Macmillan Company. 306 pages. 50 cents.

That "the lectures of this volume were delivered before the Divinity School of Yale University \* \* \*, 1910, on the Lyman Beecher Foundation," may have been overlooked by many who know that they have brought grace and wisdom to their own ministry. Few preachers who read are now ignorant of this

strong, wise and suggestive book. By being placed in the "Standard Library" series it has been placed within easy reach of every preacher and one could wish that they would all get it.

**The Fisherman, Tackle and Bait: A Practical Companion for Soul-Winners.** Compiled by Raleigh Wright, Ph.D.; Edited by Weston Bruner, Th.D., D.D., General Evangelist of the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, New York, 1913; Fleming H. Revell Company. 144 pages. 20c net.

In a little pocket volume there are here arranged under an alphabetical topic plan scriptures and occasional comments for the use of Christian workers. It is remarkably complete and will be of great service to workers and to unskilled students of Christianity and the Bible. Christian Science, Spiritualism, Russellism, etc., are introduced, some of their worst errors briefly stated and the Scripture teaching set over against them. A system of cross-references adds to the value. All in all this is the best thing of the sort to be had.

**Woman in Modern Society.** By Earl Barns. B. W. Hübsch, N. Y. 1912. 257 pages.

Earl Barns is always interesting, no matter how far one may disagree with his conclusions. A certain daring and jauntiness in dealing with subjects of profoundest importance fascinate while the reader may reprobate and gasp. This volume is marked by the author's usual characteristics. It is interesting from cover to cover. It deals with almost every phase of the modern woman's life which is now under discussion—her heritage from the past, her work in education and the progressive feminizing of culture, her economic independence and place in industry, the significance of political life and woman's relation to this form of activity, the modern family and its vocation.

The author recognizes the inherent differences which distinguish the sexes from each other, marking important differences of function and place in society. It is not a question of equality or inequality in the same fields but of equal opportunity for each sex in its own sphere, for which the author pleads or thinks he pleads.

The author is not very friendly to religion, declaring that "as between man and woman, Christianity has given every possible advantage to men, and has added needlessly to the natural burdens of women." p. 43. Curiously enough it is declared that "Mariolatry came to bless the world," p. 45, and on the following page it is asserted that the Protestant Reformation elevated woman. The last statement is true, but the first is absolutely false, for woman has been degraded by celibacy and saint worship as can be seen by referring to any Catholic country where woman is always debased and deprived of privileges that she enjoys in Protestant countries.

Woman's suffrage is favored strongly and arguments against it are regarded as antiquated. There is a fine summary of the significance of political duties and activities and as strong an argument as can be made, wrought out on this basis. The most objectionable contention of the book is its advocacy of freedom of divorce. Apparently the author would put no restraint whatsoever on divorce proceedings. A sense of incompatibility and desire to sever the marriage tie for any reason whatsoever would have the author's approval. He would remove all semblance of religious sanction and make marriage purely a matter of state action. Marriage would finally rest on the presence and continuance of human love or the wish to live together.

**Children at Play in Many Lands: A Book of Games.** By Katherine Stanley Hall. Illustrated by Spencer Baird Nichols. New York, 1912, Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada. xi+92 pages.

This entertaining and instructive book of games of children is arranged by nationalities after an opening chapter of "Games that are known almost everywhere." The last chapter gives directions for costumes. [The work offers possibilities for children's missionary meetings and home programmes.]

**American Baptist Year Book, 1913.** J. G. Walker, D.D., Editor. American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia. 284 pages. 50c net; postage 6c.

Избранные  
избранные  
избранные